

# THE SATIRIST,

OR,

## MONTHLY METEOR.

---

JULY 1, 1811.

---

### LAND AND COMMERCE.

---

*Vis unita fortior!*

---

THE necessity, the *absolute* necessity of unanimity, for the salvation of the empire, was never so important as at the present moment; yet, unfortunately, this is the very moment chosen by theorists and experimentalists to promulgate their self-sufficient paradoxes, and to advocate practical alterations, under the name of practical reform; alterations, whose probable result, if experience may be depended on, would rend asunder both the *moral* and *physical* chains, links that hold us in social order. The long contested clamour of agriculture *versus* commerce has been so wire-drawn, that our readers may expect the subject to be totally incapable of novelty; yet as a "*practical result*," drawn from the reveries of wild theorists, has lately evinced itself, in direct opposition to the dictates of common sense and the two first rules of common arithmetic, we cannot permit the subject to pass without notice, particularly as our pages fall so often in the way of those to whom a few seasonable hints may not be unserviceable.

If our inveterate enemy had the power of moulding

VOL. IX. B

62

Englishmen's minds to his will, there is no process which he would undertake so readily, as that of exciting jealousy between the *landed* and *commercial* interests of Britain; well knowing that the improvement, nay, the existence of each, depends in a great measure on mutual support. Unfortunately for us, however, his interference is unnecessary,\* and we have too lately seen, that an ill-founded jealousy on the part of the landed interest, has confirmed a course of proceeding, detrimental to the vital existence even of the landed interest itself, subversive of colonial welfare, and actually furthering those plans, which Napoleon is attempting to bring into action by his present system.

That we have all due deference for a decision of the Upper House, we think nobody will deny; but that deference can never prevent us from pointing out the necessity of reconsideration, on any subject which may have passed before them. With respect to the late decision, respecting distillation from sugar in preference to corn, that, perhaps, is the only question on which the Upper House is not so competent to decide as the Lower; the only question on which habit or self-interest could possibly, though insensibly, bias them. That each vote was given conscientiously, we strictly believe; nor can we agree with those who asserted that the vote of a certain noble peer, in opposition to his party, was dictated by his own colonial interests; but every man who has studied the human heart will acknowledge that habits of thinking, induced by a consideration of self-interest, will often form and give force to opinions, which can only be overturned by calm and deliberate reasoning; it follows, therefore,

---

\* We do not say, however, that his interference has not taken place; we will not, indeed, pretend to *register* the name of his *political* workmen; but the old proverb says, "that nobody does the Devil's work, without being *paid* for it!"

that those who *may possibly* be biassed, should investigate deliberately, and even reconsider opinions, whose effects may be hurtful to themselves and others. In the one house, we find the landed interest only; in the other, an admixture, perhaps a due admixture, of both; it is not difficult, therefore, to conceive how a difference of opinion may exist amongst men equally conscientious and equally honorable.

The points, however, to which we shall call the attention of our right honorable readers are few in number, and simple in theory; and are capable of proof, or of denial, from the simplest rules of arithmetic; nor is it necessary that a man should be either an agriculturist or commercialist to understand them.

Under the old system of agriculture, the fallows always made two years in seven unproductive; under the new system, there is an *annual* production; that, however, arises from the introduction of sheep-feeding, a measure which would never pay the farmer, if he depended on the sale of his stock for food only. It follows then, that the price of the wool is what remunerates the farmer, and enables him to pay his high rents; but that price would be insufficient, nor would *all* his wool be purchased, if there was not a *vent for manufactures*; for the mere consumption of clothing at home would take off a very small portion of the raw article. The necessity, then, of foreign and colonial export is obvious; if these cease, the price of the raw article falls; and the farmer will be less able to pay his high rents than he would possibly be by any probable fall of corn. Yet it is this fear of a fall in corn, which seems at present to terrify the landed interest; we will therefore, examine it coolly. The agricultural advocates assert that if any thing happens to reduce the price, the former will grow less. That, however, we must absolutely deny. The farmer will always grow that which pays him



best; and if he does not grow corn, he can raise no other produce that will pay him so well, even if there was a fall of thirty per cent.; nay, even then, we do not think that the poor man's loaf would be too cheap!

From this we may safely conclude that the *public* need not be alarmed at these ideal terrors of the farmer leaving off ploughing and sowing, and reaping; there are few who will let their land lie idle, or that will refuse to sell their corn for as good a price as they can get; yet it is this fear of a *new* system which has induced so many to object to the distillation from sugar in preference to grain, under certain modifications. Now we know, that even during the period of distillation from sugar in 1810, the importation of grain amounted to *several millions* of pounds sterling, principally paid in *English guineas*, thus draining the empire of its circulating medium, lowering the rate of exchange, and encouraging the agriculture of our inveterate enemy; why then have not the landed interest objected to an importation on so large a scale? If they fear not that an importation on so large a scale will be detrimental to the interest of agriculture, with what justice can they complain of a substitution which never can exceed *one million*, per annum, and can, therefore, have no other possible effect, but to reduce the importation, without diminishing the demand?

The distilleries never use more than 470,000 quarters, which may amount to about 950,000*l.*; if all distillation from corn was stopped, the quantity of sugar required would be 770,000*cwt.*, or about 60,000*hhd.*s. Distillation from sugar then would find a vent for that quantity of colonial produce, and would keep a million annually out of the enemy's pocket; two advantages which we should presume to be fully equivalent to any possible fall in the price of corn in our home markets, *if that would be an*



evil! But those who fear that a fall in prices may lower their rents, ought to recollect that the farmer does not depend entirely on *home consumption*. If export diminishes, the demand for the raw article which the farmer has for sale will diminish also: and no doubt the West Indian exports must diminish, if the planter cannot sell his produce. Whatever injures the colonies, therefore, must injure agriculture, for the West Indies take one quarter of our exports. Whatever diminishes our exports must injure our shipping trade, and every thing connected with it, as imports must diminish in the same proportion; and it ought to be remembered that one third of our imports come from our Trans-atlantic colonies. Will any man in his senses then say, that we ought to tamper with a concern which, even twenty years ago, employed a capital of eighty-six and a half millions? Will any man say that we ought, under all these circumstances, to shut our ears and our eyes to existing evils respecting our colonies, when the export of sugar, which formerly amounted to one fourth of the whole import, is totally stopped, and when even that might be remedied by a procedure which could not possibly hurt the farmer, whilst it would diminish the resources of the enemy, and do more towards keeping our money in the country than half a hundred bullion reports.

We have here nothing to say to Mr. Horner, or Mr. Spence, or any other theorist; but we will bring the opponents of sugar distillation to a test. Will they be satisfied with a law which shall permit sugar distillation, when corn arrives at a certain price; and which shall contain a clause to forbid importation of grain, until corn arrives at that standard? If they agree to this, the evil may be remedied; if they do not, we must pity their prejudices, and lament their fatuity; but we must close with this short

observation, that the landed interest have no right to object to commercial and domestic regulations on this subject, *as long as they themselves are unable to supply the demand for corn!*



### THE ENGLISHMAN, No. IV.

Sæpe tribus lectis, video cœnare quaternos,  
Equibus unus avet quavis aspergere cunctis,  
Præter eum qui præbet aquam: post, hunc quoque, potus  
Condita quum verax aperit præcordia liber.  
Hic tibi comis et urbanus liberque videtur.

HORACE.

THE contemplation of the similarity between the progress of that luxury and effeminacy in the Roman empire, which eventually caused its downfall, and the present manners and views of the British nation, must give birth to apprehensions that the present prosperity of this happy isle may be in like manner the immediate forerunner of its decline. The more attentively and minutely we consider the subject, the more are we struck with the similitude between the two nations: the flourishing state of the arts and sciences, the brilliancy of our military and naval exploits, and the luxury which pervades the higher ranks of society, are not the only qualities by which we may examine the respective state of those empires. If we descend to particulars, and compare the manners of private life, as delineated by the nervous pens of the Roman satirists, with the scenes which are daily exhibited in the present age, we cannot avoid feeling astonished at

the coincidence between the vices which called for reprehension amid the luxuries of the Augustan age, and those which now attract our attention. The scene represented by Horace in the motto to the present essay, exhibits a striking resemblance to the amusements of a modern tea-table. Scandal and detraction appear on each occasion to furnish the most agreeable food for conversation, and though, it is true, that the usual absence of inebriation from the tea-table secures the host from becoming the subject of reprehension, so long as he continues "*præbere aquam*," yet a succeeding evening will place his character on a level with those whose conduct at that time provided him with a source of amusement.

It is painful to observe that this habit of receiving pleasure from the recital of the indiscretions or calamities of our fellow creatures is most prevalent among the female sex, and occupies that time, and exerts those abilities which might be productive of so much more gratification, if employed in the enjoyment of rational conversation. The cultivation of the female mind has at length obtained the approbation of our enlightened nation, and the acquirements of our countrywomen are no longer confined to the knowlege of the ingredients of a pudding, or the execution of the Decalogue in ornamental tapestry. Literature and the arts have already received considerable assistance and embellishment from the labours of our fair countrywomen, and the diffusion of knowlege appears to add universal charms to the brightest ornaments of the creation. The superiority of the modern system of education is, perhaps, the chief cause of scandal and calumny being generally considered as the peculiar characteristics of antiquated virginity. Envy and disappointment have frequently been considered the origin of the confinement of this vice to the hopeless sisterhood; but it may perhaps



with more propriety be attributed to the difference between female education in the present age, and in the middle of the last century.

The effects of scandal are the more certain and more inevitable, inasmuch as their operations are generally secret, and their progress imperceptible. An open accusation or a manly criticism may, if incorrect, be easily refuted, and if malicious and libellous will subject the author to the vengeance of the law, but the insidious whispers of a concealed enemy or, what is worse, of a pretended friend, infuse the deadly canker into the vitals of a character, which is perhaps blameless, and imperceptibly destroy the fair promise of a blooming and hopeful reputation, without the possibility of discovery or eradication. The sacred bonds of friendship present but a feeble barrier to the attacks of a calumniator, particularly if his cautious intimations are accompanied by a feigned anxiety for the welfare of the man, who is designated as his prey. Whatever may be the indignation of the unfortunate victim of detraction in ordinary cases, how much more acutely must his feelings be wounded, when he discovers himself to be the sport of a man, for whom he has once entertained sentiments of esteem and friendship? The royal Psalmist upbraids a faithless friend with inconstancy in terms of the most exquisite pathos; "For it is not an  
"open enemy that hath done me this dishonour, for then  
"I could have borne it, neither was it mine adversary  
"that did magnify himself against me, for then perad-  
"venture I would have hid myself from him; but it was  
"even thou, my companion, my guide, and mine own  
"familiar friend; we took sweet counsel together, and  
"walked in the house of God as friends."

MISELLA had in her youth received an education superior to the generality of her acquaintance, and possessed

considerable natural talents, and a tolerable share of personal accomplishments. During a long residence on the Continent she had acquired the insinuating address and refined *politesse* of the French, and was complete mistress of those arts of dissimulation which so peculiarly characterize their nation. Possessed of a penetrating mind and fascinating manners, her acquaintance was courted by every one, and she obtained opportunities of contracting friendships the most advantageous to the interests of herself and family, but a conscious superiority induced her constantly to indulge in decrying the merits even of her dearest and most valuable friends. Her ready wit and acute criticisms could not fail to amuse her acquaintance, who little suspected that they were destined shortly to feel the severity of her lash. In order to maintain an appearance of friendship, she was compelled to have recourse to the grossest dissimulation, which soon became the most predominant feature in her character: she was, in fact, (to adopt the concise expression of Sallust,) "*Cujuslibet rei simulator ac dissimulator.*" Circumstances rendered it advisable that she should appear charitable, she accordingly assiduously visited the mansions of poverty, and attended at the bed of sickness, but the constant parade with which she displayed her munificence, and blazoned forth to the world her own virtues, evinced that she was solely actuated by selfish motives. She was alike ungratefully forgetful of kindness received by herself, and insolently mindful of the smallest favors conferred on her dependants. Although some passages of her own life were enveloped in impenetrable mystery, she was constantly on the alert to detect any little impropriety in others, and assiduously to aggravate the recital of the slightest deviation from the rules of decorum. At length, the mean arts to which she had descended in order to

obtain food for her insatiable passion for detraction and scandal, together with a full conviction of her insidious duplicity, by degrees alienated the friendship of all her acquaintance, while the application of her talents to laudable pursuits, might have rendered her an invaluable treasure to her friends, and a brilliant ornament to society.

Nottingham,

June 14<sup>th</sup>, 1811.

---

### CATHOLIC CLAIMS.

---

It is unfortunate for the cause of truth, that those who pretend to be its warmest advocates too often have recourse to misrepresentation, or impute to their opponents grounds of *defence* or of *attack* which they never thought of. By this mode of proceeding, nothing is easier than to convict an antagonist of absurdity, or to render his argumentative position untenable, as he is thus obliged apparently to fight on ground chosen for him, and with such weapons as may be permitted him to use. This indeed is a proceeding which can have no effect but on the ignorant or the prejudiced; but unhappily those classes are so numerous that they will always be able by clamour and assertion to draw the still small voice of reason. To those reflections we have often been led in reviewing the arguments of those who call themselves friends of Catholic Emancipation; they never attempted to *prove* their own claims, but always either called on the opposite party to overturn them, or endeavoured to place that party in a position where their weapons might appear useless. Such



has invariably been the procedure up to the period when we noticed the question of *Catholic Claims* some months back; a new mode however has been adopted, and we have seen an attempt, though happily unsuccessful, to bully the Legislature into a measure which the universal sense of the majority of the nation disapproves.

We have heard it said that the mover of the question, in a late meeting on the subject, made an *argumentative* and *unanswerable* speech; to judge of it from the report in the Times newspaper which we presume will by all parties be allowed to be a correct one, we are by no means disposed to allow its claims of being *argumentative*; but that it was *unanswerable*, at least at the moment, we will not deny, for it is impossible that those who came prepared for the general question, could ever have supposed that positions so insulting to the country at large, and even to the Catholics themselves, would have been brought forward. One powerful objection which we have always had to the conduct of the advocates for Catholic Emancipation, was the studied ambiguity of their demands; the cry for *unqualified emancipation* we have always considered as meaning much more than was expressed, and that objection is by no means done away by the late petition. If men come forward insisting on a redress of grievances without stating what these grievances are, how is it possible that those whose place it is to yield the redress can know what will satisfy the claimants? As well might Mr. Waithman, when selling a shawl, ask the customer what he would give for it, and refuse to name a price himself, as the Catholics say, "Redress our grievances," and yet at the same time neglect to say where these grievances affect them. Some indeed have gone so far as to say that they wished to be put on an equal footing with the *Protestants*, to which others have added, "Protestant

subjects without any stigma of statute law existing against them;" now this seems at first sight very liberal and moderate, but unfortunately the *Protestant succession as established by law* comes under that general designation of *stigmata*, and we presume, or hope at least, that those who call themselves the *liberal* party, are not yet so liberal as to yield *that* point to their *Catholic brethren*.

The late petition has exactly the failing of all preceding ones, in containing nearly a general demand; this appears however in the opinion of the mover, to be a great advantage, for he is said to have asserted that, "the Catholics have *wisely* refrained from stating their grievances in this petition!"—and that they have shewn wisdom in thus refraining we are indeed well disposed to believe, for had they made such demands as their advocate ventured to promulgate, their petition would have been scouted without further investigation. According to the report in the *Times*, we are told that the Catholics claim seats in the Legislature, the capability of holding offices in the Bank, of being Sheriffs of counties, of occupying the highest offices in the army, (Commander-in-Chief we suppose,) eligibility to the great law offices (which of course includes the Chancellorship); and we are also told that they complain of being deprived of civil liberties, of being *galled by tythes*, and *oppressed by landlords*! Now in our late observations on Catholic Claims, we expressly said that the lower order of Catholic peasantry, if called on to enumerate those grievances from which *emancipation* would liberate them, would invariably name *tythes*, *taxes*, and *rents*! but we did not expect that the Protestant advocates of Catholicism would speak out so soon, and so plainly.

To enter into an elaborate discussion of those claims, now thus expressly brought forward, and which we have

no certainty are *all* that will be made, would far exceed our limits; but we shall just notice in regular order, that Catholic Legislators, and Catholic Privy Counsellors are incompatible with a Protestant establishment, and a Protestant monarch; that offices in the Bank, Shrievalties, &c., &c., are not attainable by *any dissenters* from the Established Church, so that the Catholics either wish to have advantages over *Protestant* dissenters, or to *abolish the Test Act*; that the charge of their being deprived of civil liberty, or of any participation in the state, is merely a generalization of specific grievances already mentioned; that the abolition of tythes would be no advantage to the occupiers of small farms, as rents would rise in proportion, and that "oppression by their landlords" cannot well take place, where there is a due administration of, and submission to the laws; unless by *oppression* they mean a legal enforcement of rents.

These things however may almost be considered as minor points, when put in comparison with other passages in this famous speech. The atrocious proceedings of the catholic rebels, in 1641, are justified upon a strange accusation of somebody then in office having attempted to destroy some charters, and we are told that "it was this perfidious act that laid the foundation for the *blood and massacre* that ensued, and which *were only the legitimate offspring of the unprincipled baseness and perfidy of a tyrannical, wicked, and illegal government!!!*"—and when we consider that in addition to this, the mover is stated to have said, "I have no hesitation in saying that the number of the Irish Catholics is sufficient to turn the scales of empire!" we may then judge of the effects likely to result from statements of this nature.

But it is curious to observe how these catholic advocates always talk as if *Ireland and Catholicism* were



synonymous; when in fact, the population of Ireland consists of not more than two millions of Catholics, whilst the *Protestants* amount to one million and a half, possessing at the same time nine-tenths of the property in the country.

It is no less curious, that those who call themselves the *liberal* party, are always accusing their opponents of being *prejudiced*—thus we are told, “that the persons who made the charges against the Catholics, might believe them founded in conscience and in truth, he would not deny; *but he thought them prejudiced.*” Now we would ask, is it a prejudice to believe, as history tells us, that whenever the English and Irish Catholics *have had power*, they have been intolerant; or to say to them, “enjoy your own religion as you will, but we shall take warning from experience, and prevent you from disturbing us in the enjoyment of ours.”

We have every respect for the honest, conscientious Catholics; we believe their intentions to be good, and their loyalty unshaken; but we know that the catholic religion is a *converting* religion, and that the very goodness of heart, which we esteem and admire in our Catholic brethren, is precisely that feeling, which if they had power, would induce them to endeavour to bring *heretics* into the pale of their church. It is that which we dread, and which we would guard against. To the Catholics we would give every thing which can be beneficial to them, but we would yield nothing which can endanger the Protestant establishment, or the granting of which, might lead to a contest for superiority; for, however paradoxical it may appear, it is in the conservation of the Protestant establishment and the Protestant ascendancy, that the Catholics of both kingdoms, have the best security for their present happiness, their existing rights, and their future liberty!!!

CREDIDI, propter quod locutus sum.

---

MR. SATIRIST,

THE man who boldly dares to stand forth the champion of the church and established religion of his country, who publicly censures and reproves the vices of its *unworthy* ministers, and in so doing, proclaims himself "no respecter of persons," must necessarily himself become the subject of conversation and conjecture, especially in the neighbourhood whence his observations issue, and where the objects of his animadversions reside. Such has been my situation since the month of November last, and numerous have been the suppositions concerning me, as the author of the papers published through your medium under the signature of "Censor," and the cavils and objections advanced by various persons against them. Every individual will naturally advocate the cause of his relative, friend, or acquaintance, and it frequently happens, that the virtues and good qualities of a man are extolled and represented in the most favorable point of view, whilst his vices are totally overlooked or palliated as excusable failings, notwithstanding they may have the ascendant in his character. With reference to one of the clergymen, whose conduct made the subject of my remarks in your thirty-eighth number, a gentleman has expressed his opinion, that the observations were unjust, for the reason aptly expressed in the following words of the Satirist Boileau:

*Attaquer lui! oh c'est un si bon homme!*

Others have declared, that my motive for appearing in your pages, and attacking the clergy, in what they emphatically denominate so *unjustifiable* a manner, is merely

a wish to gratify a certain "*cacoethes scribendi*," and that I am very far from harbouring any sterling desire for that reformation, which I proclaim so indispensable. To such wranglers I will reply in the words of Tully,

*Quid de me alii loquantur, ipsi videant, sed loquentur tamen;*

and that, whilst I can avow "*mens sibi conscia recti*," I value not *their* opinions. The actions of every man, of right, ought to be considered as proceeding from a pure source, until the contrary is indubitably proved; and, as I have already distinctly declared, the genuine reasons and inducements for publishing my remarks on so important a subject, it were puerile and tautological here to repeat them.

It has been urged by your admonitory friend "*Moderator*," in his concise epistle, that the public exposure of the vices and immoralities of the clerical order, will in its effect, be more productive of injury than benefit to the cause it professes to maintain. That the remedy is worse than the disease I deny; a skilful physician where a malady increases so rapidly as to baffle his ordinary efforts, will frequently, as a last resource, apply medicines vulgarly called "*kill or cure*," and though I would most unwillingly admit that the defection of our national clergy from pious and ethical virtues, has arrived at its acme, yet when evils are self-evident, some remedy is surely requisite to counteract them, and the language which strives to excite it cannot be too impressive; for,

*Pulchrum est benefacere reipublicæ, (et ecclesiæ); etiam benedicere. haud absurdum est.*

*Moderator* exclaims, that it "*behoves every man who has the interest of his country at heart, to promote, as far as his limited powers will extend, that proper respect we all owe, and which is so justly due to our spiritual pastors, instead of sapping the very foundation of our*



religion, by holding them forth to the public as objects of ridicule." What, Mr. Satirist, are we to understand by this sentence? As one of those who have enrolled themselves under the banners, and entered the lists in defence of the church, and who in that capacity have been honored by the attention of the Editor and Readers of the Satirist, I feel individually called upon by this epistle of your correspondent. So far as it refers to the two hundred and sixty-second number of the Spectator, I consider *that paper itself* aided by your comment as decisive; but the sentence which I have above quoted, inasmuch as I am aware of its application to myself, demands a little more notice. That every man who *has* the interest of his country at heart, *will* and *does* promote that respect which is due to the collective body of the clergy, there cannot be a doubt; the fundamental principles of our religion and constitution require it, and as the representatives and supporters of that religion, the clergy receive it. When respect is *justly due* to our spiritual pastors, every attempt to hold them forth as objects of ridicule, will inevitably recoil with accumulated violence upon the head of him whose audacity presumes to censure them; for the man who conscientiously discharges his duty as a minister of the gospel of Christ, and in *so doing*, becomes entitled to our reverence and esteem, will ever rise triumphant over the futile endeavours of a designing incendiary to depreciate his worth. Those characters, whose infamous practices I have attempted on former occasions to represent in their true colours, cannot, if my descriptions are correct, be classed under the above denomination; for that any respect is individually their right, I am sure Moderator himself (if he has regularly perused the papers he alluded to, under the title of "Clerical Delinquents," which he will pardon me if I doubt,) will not be bold enough to affirm.

Is any respect due or paid to a private member of society who has forfeited the esteem of his fellow creatures, by habitual and undisguised arrogance, deceit, libertinism, inebriation, or impiety? Do not we regard the overbearing, unjust magistrate, the hypocritical friend, the licentious adulterer, and the presumptuous atheistical drunkard, as objects of disgust and even horror? How then can we render any respect to men, who, cloathed in the vesture of religion, and in whom we expect to behold the most pure examples of virtue and piety, eclipse the most abandoned of the laity in their excesses, and descend to the meanest acts of fraudulent hypocrisy? The remarks which I have addressed to you on this subject, were never intended to produce the ridicule of the public; in my opinion, the derision of the multitude will be much sooner excited by the actions of those, who, in the words of the admirable Cowper,

Make God's work a sinecure,  
Slaves to their passions, and their patron's pride :—  
The things that mount the rostrum with a skip,  
And then skip down again; pronounce a text;  
Cry hem; and reading what they never wrote,  
Just fifteen minutes, huddle up their work,  
And with a well bred whisper close the scene!!!

In addition to what I have already stated, I am peculiarly happy in the ability to produce the decisive opinion of the Attorney-general, expressed on this subject on a recent occasion in the court of King's Bench. "I know how the interests of religion suffer, when crimes like the present are committed in the garb of sanctity, but *it is better to strip that garb, and punish those crimes, than longer to conceal a villain's real character.* Apparently the interests of religion may suffer more in the eye of the public by this exposure, BUT REALLY THEY DO NOT, the criminal might do more mischief, &c."

Our church teaches in the 26th Article of Religion, that  
“ Although in the visible church the *evil* be ever mingled  
“ with the good, and some time the evil have the chief  
“ authority in the ministration of the word and sacraments,  
“ yet for as much as they do not the same in their own  
“ name but in Christ's, and do administer by his com-  
“ mission and authority, we may use their ministry both  
“ in hearing the word of God, and in receiving the sacra-  
“ ments. Neither is the effect of God's ordinance taken  
“ away by their wickedness, nor the grace of God's gifts  
“ diminished from such as by faith, and rightly, do receive  
“ the sacraments ministered unto them, which be effectual  
“ because of Christ's institution and promise, although  
“ they be ministered by evil men.” Thus we ought not  
to be deterred from the rigid performance of our religious  
duties, by the depravity which is so prevalent in the lives  
of some of our pastors ; and a truly virtuous man will not  
discontinue a regular attendance at his parish church, and  
absent himself from the holy communion, or otherwise  
omit his various duties, because the minister who ought  
to be his spiritual monitor and immediate pattern is be-  
come unworthy his imitation as a Christian, or his esteem  
and confidence as a man. The great Captain of his salva-  
tion he will ever find an example ; and whilst he repro-  
bates the wickedness, contemns the meanness, or detests  
the dissolute conduct of the unworthy ambassador of  
Christ, he will pity his weakness, and sincerely pray for  
his amendment. Some allowance must however of ne-  
cessity be made for the foibles and infirmities of human  
nature, and the effects which concurring circumstances  
will unavoidably produce upon the mind : and though  
some men may have within themselves from education or  
otherwise, ingenite virtue and religion, sufficiently predom-  
inant to enable them, in spite of evil example, to perse-



vere with undeviating zeal in the paths of rectitude, virtue, and godliness, yet such is very far from being the situation of a great majority. Precept and example in matters of every description, more especially in religion, ought to be linked and interwoven together with the most scrupulous precision, the former unattended by the latter, degenerates into contemptible folly. The vulgar and untaught classes oftener will pay more attention, and receive more essential advantage from a plain and unadorned discourse, founded upon the self-evident truths of the Gospel, pronounced by a man "*whose life his faith and doctrine justifies,*" than those learned and abstruse dissertations, whose sentences teem with metaphorical allusions, and highflown oratory, proceeding from those of our clergy who "*poor in morals and in manners vain,*" descending from the pulpit leave their religion on the cassoc.

Your correspondent Flagellator in one of his communications states, that the clerical strictures and castigation which have distinguished the Satirist, have, in this neighbourhood at least, totally failed of effecting any amendment, and that the subjects themselves are heedless of that merited exposure of which their glaring improprieties have been the cause. This assertion has already been contradicted in some measure in the first paper of the intelligent "*Englishman.*" Your readers will recollect that in your 38th Number I exhibited to their view in a cursory manner amongst others, a clergyman who had for years been in the nefarious practice of appropriating the consecrated alms of charity to his private purposes. A more disgraceful fact never blotted your pages, and in comparison with this man, Turpin the notorious highwayman, or Barrington the ingenious pickpocket, may merit the appellation of virtuous. These men it is true wrested from their fellow-creatures by force or fraud the means of existence, but

what were *their* professions, and upon *whom* did *they* fix as the objects of *their* depredations? Not the *poor and needy*, but the wealthy and opulent, who had received a superabundant allowance of the good things of this world. I enter not the lists of extenuation; I would hereby expose the contrast. For their crimes they atoned with their forfeit life and liberty, and the hand of justice, though long suspended, at length arrested their course. Let us now examine the character before us. Educated and ordained as a clergyman of the Church of England, placed by the hand of Providence above mediocrity, his situation is such as to enable him not only to enjoy every felicity here, but to lighten the burthens and alleviate the miseries of his indigent or unfortunate parishioners; yet this man could meanly condescend to withhold from the poor and infirm, the scanty portion afforded for their relief and comfort by the hard-earned gains of industry, and oblations offered at the Lord's Supper!! If such has been his continued practice for fifteen years, what must have been his sensations, if the hours of conviviality have ever admitted of reflection? Though the sums thus misapplied, were but small, and in his contemplation trifling, yet the purposes for which they were intended were sacred, and by their aid the mouth of the hungry would have been filled. To this gentleman, perhaps, the author of the *Englishman* alludes, when he relates the fact of a clergyman having expended fifteen pounds in the purchase of blankets, which he distributed amongst his needy parishioners, as some trifling retribution for his former iniquity. This circumstance indicates if not a reformation certainly some feelings of remorse, and in the midst of our accusations 'twere no more than justice to afford the tribute of encouragement and approbation where we behold symptoms of a return to rectitude. Whether this appropriation was ade-

quate in amount to the alms withheld, I presume not to calculate; but in thus attempting a recompence, did he, I would ask, recollect those trifling sums which were so frequently borrowed for the sake of convenience, and *ostensibly* offered as *his* mite at the sacrament?

That some of my "likenesses are correctly drawn" the above circumstance will in some degree evince; and in order to prove that no very great difficulty opposed the discovery of "whom they were intended to represent," I will beg leave to add that one of your numbers containing some of these *likenesses* has received the perusal and consideration of a Gentleman eminent at the bar as to its tendency.

Though I will not attack with the harshness of accusation, I will take the liberty of addressing a few words of admonition to a certain young clergyman resident in this county. To the punctual performance of his professional duties having more than once been an eye-witness, I rejoice to bear a favourable testimony, and were every branch of his conduct equally meritorious, with pleasure would I offer, even in the pages of the Satirist, the suffrage of gratitude and commendation. The sun of propriety gilds the morning of his days, and sheds his beams benignant upon him; yet in the midst of blessings he forgets the Giver of all good, and the minute and more private duties of his ministry are I fear nearly omitted. With all the thoughtlessness and levity of intoxicated youth, he prefers the character of a keen fox-hunter, and a staunch sportsman, to the more important application of a faithful steward of God. The rich living to which he has been instituted, will probably be more prejudicial than advantageous to him, by enabling him to pursue these his delights with greater avidity; and one of his exclamations to a brother parson upon information of its vacancy, me-



thinks but ill became a clergyman, "That its situation " would be vastly convenient for hunting, as being in the " centre of various packs of fox-hounds and a fine sport- " ing country," was an observation more suitable to a nobleman's hunting box than an ecclesiastical cure; and I hope that to possess a stud of hunters, and stables for their accommodation which have become the admiration of his brethren in the chace, is not the highest glory and ambition of which his mind is capable. The contrast which at different times appears in his character is truly astonishing, for on the Sabbath he ascends his pulpit with a meekness of deportment, and expounds the Word of God with a perspicuity and distinctness worthy the imitation of his seniors; and on the following day he halloos the hounds with all the slang and uproar of his brother sportsmen.

If this gentleman (for I really believe he deserves the epithet) would calmly consider how completely incompatible are the two characters he endeavours to support, if he would impartially examine their respective merits, and the pleasures and advantages he derives and will ultimately derive from each, aided by reflection upon his solemn engagements, the important trust which is imposed upon him, and the momentous duties which he is *bound to fulfil*, as the religious superintendant of a considerable number of his fellow creatures, whose eternal welfare is committed to his charge, I am convinced that his good sense, disposition, and principles, would lead him to decide without hesitation. If he would firmly resolve to shake off the trammels of pleasure, and elevate the shield of religion against its insidious attractions and the shafts of ridicule, I scruple not to pronounce that in him the Church of England would possess a most able and zealous advocate and defender.

In addressing this paper to you I am induced, Mr. Editor, to request an early insertion. A rumour has of late been prevalent in this neighbourhood, which if not contradicted, will inevitably be prejudicial to the future character and circulation of your work, the exalted and unbiassed independence of which has obtained, and hitherto secured, you that reputation to which your praiseworthy and unwearied exertions have entitled you. The report to which I allude is simply this : that an application has in form been made to you, to request the positive rejection of all future communications in any manner relative to the clergy, and that you have promised that no future article on this subject shall appear in your pages. The professions which accompanied your publication when it was originally presented to the world, and to which you have ever strictly adhered, at once give a positive denial to this assertion, yet I hope you will not deem my observation improper or misapplied when I exclaim, that an unqualified contradiction is alike due to you and your readers.

*Nottingham,*

CENSOR.\*

*June 19th, 1811.*

\* In reply to the concluding remark of our friend CENSOR, we have only to observe, that we never have entered into any such compromise as that to which he alludes, neither on this nor on any other occasion whatsoever. We certainly have refused to insert various articles relative to the clergy, because we considered that they rather tended to bring the whole sacred order into contempt, than to correct individual profligacy. We know not even the names of the parties to whom CENSOR's and our other Nottingham correspondents' strictures allude.

## REFORM.

Mr. Brand. [1st. Player.] I hope we have reformed that indifferently with us.

Sir Francis Burdet. [Hamlet.] O, reform it altogether!

HAMLET. *Adapted for Representation.*

MR. SATIRIST,

I wonder that a gentleman of your presumed parts and knowledge, who in your own official capacity certainly labour hard to "reform the manners of the times," should declare yourself so decidedly against the REFORMERS of the British *Forum*, the London *Guildhall*, and the Freemason's *Tavern*. Nay, my wonder rises still higher, and I feel amazed, astonished, and confounded, when I perceive that most illustrious personage H. R. H. the Prince Regent mark his sovereign contempt for their proceedings so very conspicuously, by *changing* the day of his GRAND REVIEW on Wimbledon Heath, and appointing Monday, the 10th of June, 1811, for that glorious spectacle: thereby (*intentionally*, no doubt) withdrawing from Messrs. Wood, Byng, Waithman, Soames, Baldwin, Jones, Ikey Pig, &c., all the flower and fruit, all the beauty and wealth, all the rank and fashion of the Metropolis.

That REFORM is wanting in every department of the state, I do firmly believe and resolutely contend: and, as it is now all the rage for ingenious projectors, and for projectors of no genius at all, mutually to bepraise each other's schemes, and to keep each other in countenance by exposing themselves respectively in their turn, allow me here, Sir, briefly to state to your readers the outlines of MY comprehensive plan.



## PLAN OF REFORM.

*Dicinity.*—The very recent rejection of Lord Sidmouth's *Bill* clearly proving the prevalent conviction of our betters, that learning and "the benefit and clergy" may henceforth be dispensed with in candidates for holy orders; I propose, therefore, that those two useless establishments for study, Oxford and Cambridge, be *reformed*: i. e. that the present undergraduates be ordained and sent to grass, forthwith; and that the spacious colleges and halls of both universities be converted, either into *Schools of REFORM*, on the modish "*Laucastrian*" scale, or into temporary *Barracks* for staunch partizans of "THE CAUSE."

*Law.*—Lord Bacon once pithily remarked, that "Truth lies at the bottom of a deep well;" meaning, I fancy, to intimate that toil and perseverance were necessary to extract it pure from legal investigation. His lordship assuredly forgot that far more important dogma of the ancient juriconsults and casuists, "*In vino veritas.*" I know, indeed, it has been stated, in a certain instance, [See *Viner Abridg. Vol. VII. p. 794 Cap. 9. §. 3. Fol.*] that "when the liquor is in, the wit is out;" but, in my opinion, the precedent is of doubtful authority. Who, that has seen our renowned O. P. chairman at *The Crown and Anchor* "*Reconciliation Dinner,*" of 4th Jan. 1810, when "flush'd with a purple grace, he shewed his *honest face*"—and, overflowing with law and liquor, harangued on REFORM and *things in general*. Who, that has seen this gentleman, Mr. Satirist, thus professionally engaged, can hesitate to admit that "*In wine is truth*"? I propose, therefore, that all our Inns of Court, viz. Lincoln's Inn, Gray's Inn, and the Temple, be made, *bona fide*, henceforth, real and substantial INNS and that the tyro students be compelled to keep term by *drinking*, no less than by

*eating*; as is just now the custom by law established and provided.

*Physic*.—The study of the *dead* languages is evidently nugatory, *prima facie*, with practitioners in medicine, whose more immediate and ostensible purpose it is, to study to make their patients *live*. Hence, highly approving Buchan's "Family" Medicine, Brodum's "Syrup," and the "Balm of Gilead," I propose that the *translation*, only, of the London PHARMACOPŒIA be published; and that every quack physician of the *body*, as well as every quack physician of the *soul*, be allowed their diplomas or licenses to slay, *secundum artem*, on paying their shillings at *Surgeons' or Apothecaries' Hall*; and this in the teeth of Hippocrates, who declared of his honorable profession,—

‘Ο βίος βραχύς, ἡ δὲ τέχνη μακρὴ, ὁ δὲ καιρὸς βῆχυς, ἡ δὲ πειρὰ σφαλερή, ἡ δὲ κρίσις χαλιπρή. Δει δὲ ὁ μόνον ἑαυτὸν παρέχειν τὰ δίκαια ποίοντα, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸν νοσούντα, καὶ τὰς παρεόντας, καὶ τὰ ἐξωθεν.—*Aphor.*

---

I trouble you with the above rough draught, Mr. Satirist, as a slight *esquisse* or *ebauche*, as our lively *Reforming* neighbours of Gaul would style it. A part may well suffice to give you an idea of the tenor of the whole. The three Professions being thus satisfactorily disposed of, I recommend my revolutionary fellow-countrymen to turn their *reforming* adzes next to the root of antiquated system and discipline in the several branches of public and private economy: in arts and arms, in sciences and manufactures, in agriculture and horticulture, in breeding in all its properties and applications, in callipaidotrophy, in nurseries of plants sensitive, active and passive, in education, in marriage, &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., &c.

I. I rejoice to find Sir Francis Burdett at the head of Mr. John Gale Jones's *Friends of REFORM*. The worthy

Baronet's elections evinced such abhorrence of bribery, perjury, profligacy, riot, and corruption, that I do think no better scavenger could be found to cleanse our Augean stalls. *Remember the Isleworth millers!*

II. I am delighted to hear Mr. Robert Waithman and Lord Stanhope, and Mr. Thelwall expound their sense of the Laws, and the Constitution, and the Bill of Rights, and Magna Charta, and Scandalum Magnatum. Really, Sir, these gentlemen set "about it and about it" in such a masterly manner as cannot fail to convince their auditory of the glorious state of confusion in which matters now stand.

III. Lords Folkestone, and Cochrane, and Col. G. L. Wardle, have fully convinced *me*, Mr. Satirist, that it is more difficult to *serve*, than to *delude* the people. I believe there has been "hell to pay." I believe a sailor (with a title) may, sometimes, "lose his reckoning." I believe a patriot may be "implicated in a foul conspiracy," and may be "guilty of subornation of witnesses, and of "wilful prevarication in his own person." All this, *and more, much more*, I do now most steadfastly believe: thanks to Lords Folkstone, and Cochrane, and Col. G. L. Wardle.

I remain, Mr. Satirist,

Yours,

A REFORMER.



## THROGMORTON STREET MEETING.

MR. SAT,

PASSING a few evenings since through *Throgmorton Street*, I happened to observe some *Gentlemen*, whose *habits* seemed much to require *reform*, slinking into a public house with a *rule and square* stuck up in the window, and whose *janitorial* ornament, said to represent a *Cat and Bagpipes*, also promised to those who could *read*, and who could *pay*, a plentiful supply of *Whitbread's Entire*.

Though the Enigmatical allusion on the sign portended nothing but *discordant harmony*, accompanied perhaps with spitting, hissing, and scratching, yet I ventured in, having first secured my pockets; and after answering to the "*Shibboleth*" that I was a "*forming gemman*," was admitted to a large room, *thinly filled*, as an *architectural* gentleman from our Sister Island observed, with a company who by their conversation before the business opened, seemed every man anxious to settle things his own way. From the appearance of the company at first, I thought I had got into one of Peter's twelpenny Demosthenic Slopshops, until I recollected that this was no place for Peter; indeed I suspected that some of the company would have no objection to rob Peter to pay Paul, nor did I doubt that many of them might be rather intimate with a certain gentleman in black, who, according to the vulgar adage, is supposed to cast an eye over the place of Peter's present residence: but seeing the chair taken by a gentleman whose blue apron and *bloody hand* pointed him out as qualified to cut up the body politic or any other body, I then found myself in an assembly whose

intended meeting had for some days been placarded along with Leake's patent pills, and other quack medicine's for reforming the constitution. After some little bustle, a gentleman *who could not get a seat* addressed the company.

"Jolmen, I rise, though by J——s I have been kipt standing this half hour to open the mating; now I am nayther *Mossynest* nor *Quin—Quin—tihyon* but you must know this is an adjourned mating, from one that never took place at all at all; for we wanted to borrow Common Garden Thayatre, or some place where they make long spaches, for we thought where other people could make long spaches, other people could do so too; and besides it might give dignity to the mating to hold it in a place where other grate men have been before us; for as Mistress O'Dempsey says, a great deal depends upon the place, for she can open her mouth and ask more for her *maykril* in Pall Mall then she can in Drury Lane or Whitechapel. But there is a Jolman by my side here, standing behind me, who says I must tell you what we have met about, but by my conscience I know no more than you do, for we agreed in the committee that it should be about nothing at all at all, for we knew that was the only way to presarve some small portion of unanimity; but I must tell you, it is a lucky thing the spalpeens cant put an end to your mating before it begins, as they did in *dare* Dublin, for though you are come from the different counties, they can't say you are *delegates*, for by J——s *nobody sent you!* and so Jolmen I set down again, that is if I can find a sate, and so I hope the resolutions I have in my hand, which the chairman has in his pocket, unless some of the honourable Jolmen present have taken them out in a mistake, will be seconded by you all, and so as I wisely observed before, I have nothin more to say, and so—"

Mr. Penzance, a great Cornish jobber, now stood up and said that the country had been long working in the dark, like the miners in his county; that he himself had long been fishing for *plaice*, but had been able to catch nothing but pilchards; that the Constitution was worn out and wanted *tinning*; and as it was fine summer weather, they might now safely pull down the *old house* and live at the watering places, till a new one was built. He then proposed some resolutions in which he informed his audience that they must all pay taxes, and parish rates, and be poor themselves, until his friends came into power; and these were seconded by Mr. Paul, who declared the propositions to be so simple as to be above all argument.

Frank Fowlett then got up, and said that he was very sorry he could not stay to hear such eloquence, but he was obliged to go to the Birdcage-walk to enquire how many soldiers had been flogged lately; he then proposed that something should be instantly done to regulate the house, for that he was unable to manage it, and said, that as all government was a mutual contract, they might act like the Irishman in the "Wags of Windsor," and discharge their master, whenever they could get a better? He then talked of *corruption* with all the technical knowledge of a scavenger, but a *millers man* happening to shake some of the flour off his jacket, it nearly choaked the orator, and he retired. Mr. Cyder then talked of white-washing the house once in three years, as the only effectual way of destroying the bugs, and when the doors were once opened, then some of the gentlemen present who understood the brush, might perhaps get in and find a job or two; but he was soon interrupted by Farringdon Dowlas, Esq., who had long been waiting for an opportunity of hearing himself speak. This *man* who had been obliged to wait so long, then addressed the meeting, and



said that "it would make a Briton's bosom glow to hear such speeches from *Country Gentleman*," for it was equal to any thing ever said by himself, by Gog or Magog, or by the orator which he had been striving to make of *wood*. He observed that the *Barber's club*, who ought of course to regulate the heads of the nation, had of late paid no attention to wig dressing; but "if they slackened in their duty," they would certainly lose his custom — Here he paused, when a Barber of long standing in the club, said that gentlemen did not know their own minds; some would only be shaved on one side, and some on the other; that he was determined to shave as *close as he could*, and that those who did not like *his plan* might go to another shop. Here ensued a violent clamour; one threw his bason of suds in his face, another swore he should eat the soap: but this was at length put an end to by the chairman, who observed that there was no difference of opinion whatever, for though some preferred one side, and some another, yet as *they all wanted shaving* they must be considered as unanimous.

Mr. *Timber*, and Mr. *Dowlas* now began to take survey of the house; but as one had a *two foot rule*, and the other a *yard wand*, they could not agree about the proper *measures*, until the annunciation of supper put an end to the debate.

This elegant collation consisted of sheep's jaws, calves pluck, and all the other delicacies of St. Giles's; and the cloth being removed, the chairman gave as a toast, "Let us all hang together and then there will be a reform;" this was drank with three times three, and followed by the patriotic song of "Tantara rara rogues all!" This song Mr. *Timber* said put him in mind of their absent friend; he would therefore give them "Tothill fields pride, and St. Giles's hope," which was drank with great applause,

and followed by many others, equally patriotic and well timed ; such as " War with Russia, and confusion to the *hemp trade* ;"—" May the cause of freedom, or its friends, never drop," &c. &c. Your's

## QUIZ.



MR. SATIRIST,

THERE is a *certain mode* in the affairs of life, which some dignify with the name of *finesse*, but which others more plainly designate by the appellation of *impudence* ! The latter term you will perhaps be disposed to apply to a production emanating from the *Friends of Reform*, and for which they have borrowed the name of a very respectable *catholic* baronet, who, though he lent his person to fill the chair of their *Freemason Parliament*, can never willingly have lent his name to one of the grossest impositions or political hoaxes ever yet ventured on by the most disingenuous reforming quack of past or present times.

The thing itself indeed would be too ridiculous and trifling to be worthy of a place in the pages of the *Satirist*, were it not that few of your readers ever see the obscure publication in which it appeared, though they may have heard something of its Editor being in a county jail for a gross public libel, and having sent up a false petition and statement to the House of Commons, and which was proved and acknowledged to be so, before the House, &c., it may be proper therefore to state that the precious *morceau* to which I allude appeared in the "*Independent Whig*" of the 9th of this month.

Now Sir, I presume that *your* readers know, what the readers of the *Independent Whig* are supposed *not* to have

known, that in the last week in May, the Common Council of the city of London rescinded a resolution of a most unbecoming nature, and one unfairly obtained; and thereby obliged the gang of reformers to choose the Freemason's Tavern for their rendezvous, instead of the Guildhall of the first corporation in the world; this circumstance, however, the *Independent Whig* carefully concealed, taking it for granted, no doubt, that a great proportion of their readers could read no other paper, either because they could not afford it, or being unable to read themselves could not have their usual dose of evening politics read to them from any other source by those hired lecturers who are stationed at all low public houses in the various courts and alleys in the metropolis, where each window informs the thirsty son of labour that the *Independent Whig* or *Statesman* is taken in, or rather sent gratis, for his edification and amusement.

On no other principle could they have dared so barefaced an imposition as to insert a letter said to be from the reforming committee to the Lord Mayor, in which, after some fulsome compliments, they say that "they do nevertheless, with a due sense of the honour done them by the *Livery* of London,\* decline taking advantage of their intended kindness, understanding that a difference of opinion exists among some of the citizens upon that subject!!! This they do out of respect to the City of London, and from their desire to prove upon this, as upon all other occasions, their uniform endeavours to avoid whatever might produce a difference of sentiment upon minor considera-

\* It must be remembered that a Common Council granted the Guildhall about the 20th May, which grant was confirmed by the *Livery* about the 25th or 26th, and rescinded by another meeting of the Common Council on the 30th, or at least all previous to the date of this Letter which is the 1st of June.



tions, and a possibility of being misunderstood, and misrepresented as unmindful of peace, union, and concord, which they are so anxious to promote amongst all ranks of their fellow subjects !!!”

To comment on this extraordinary composition, would be a step below criticism; but if they can produce no more union and concord amongst their fellow subjects (and why fellow subjects?—why not countrymen?) than they possessed amongst themselves at their meeting, they will do the country most good by keeping what little they have got *for their own use*; we are pretty quiet at present I believe, nor indeed do I fear that a cause, most of whose abettors are so contemptible, will ever be able to disturb the country *seriously* by its “union;” though I lament to contemplate how many in the *free exercise* of their rights, like the *Isleworth millers*, may be sent to the *antipodes* as Sir Richard (not poor Richard) says, or be led to perpetrate crimes that may close their career opposite to Mr. Cobbet's lodgings.

But the most amusing part of this business is, that the publisher or compiler of the Whig, has for the “lucre of gain” placed the advertisement in which the committee have acknowledged the rescinding of the grant directly under the coquettish letter alluded to!

Q IN THE CORNER.

# MESSRS. STOKES AND ALLEY.



THE following curious correspondence has taken place between these two gentlemen, in consequence of Colonel Wardle's disgraceful and ungentlemanly conduct, in betraying and wilfully misrepresenting a private table conversation. We insert them in the order in which they were given to the public, and shall then offer a few, and but a *very few* comments.

---

"MR. EDITOR,

"Temple, June 16.

"SIR—As a rude and gross statement of matter has appeared in the Morning Post and other papers of Saturday last, under the above title, permit me to assure the public, through the medium of your publication, that since I have been called upon by Mr. Stokes, I shall, in due time, and without reserve, disclose facts, which I am well prepared to prove, containing a full, though to my private feelings a painful answer to his unjust and ungenerous insinuations.

"I am, Sir, your's truly, &c.

"PETER ALLEY."

---

Golden-square, June 14, 1811.

"SIR—Publicity having been given to the insertion mentioned in the inclosed correspondence, I request you will make the correspondence that has passed equally public.

"Your most obedient Servant,

WM. STOKES.

" Golden-square, June 7, 1811.

" SIR—I see it is stated in the *Morning Chronicle* of this day, as part of the speech of Colonel Wardle on the motion respecting his Royal Highness the Duke of York, that 'Mr. Alley, his counsel, had told him that Mr. Stokes made assertions at his table, directly contrary to his oath.'—I request you will immediately write to me whether you have made the assertion imputed to you by Colonel Wardle.

" I am, Sir, your most obedient servant,

" WM. STOKES.

" To Peter Alley, Esq."

---

" \* June 8, 1811.

" SIR—As I was counsel for Colonel Wardle, I am surprised you should take the liberty of calling on me to answer the question proposed in your Letter. I hope and trust I know too well the respect due to myself, and my duty to my Client, to comply with such a request.

" Your obedient servant,

" PETER ALLEY.

" Mr. Stokes, Attorney at Law."

---

" Golden-square, June 10, 1811.

" SIR—I have this afternoon received your Letter in answer to one sent by me on Friday evening, and am *really* surprised at its contents. What had Col. Wardle or his Counsel to do with what passes at a gentleman's table? For I suppose you wish to be considered as such when you are at your own! My question to you is, whe-

" \* Mr. Alley's letter, though dated June 8, was not delivered by his servant until the 10th in the afternoon.

" WM. STOKES.



ther it is or is not true that you said to Col. Wardle what he asserts you did, as having passed at your table, when I of course must have been present, as I am represented as making the statement? *I hope and trust* you will have too much the character of a gentleman in your mind to insist upon the excuse of your profession, to do what, as a gentleman, you are compelled to do, and where your profession is not concerned. I therefore expect an early answer to my former Letter, and require you either to avow or disavow the having made the assertion to Colonel Wardle, which is as false as it is scandalous.

“ Had I been disposed to have attacked you on the score of your capacity of counsel to Col. Wardle, I should immediately after the trial of the indictment, when it must have been fresh in your recollection that you had called upon me only a fortnight before the trial, and said there was no chance of convicting the Defendants; that the motion for the new trial had let out the whole secret; and that as you expected to have other briefs from me, you wished to explain that you had not advised a prosecution where there was no chance of success, as you thought. If the scandal had been kept secret (which had nothing to do with the merits), it would have taken the Defendant's counsel by surprise, and the defendants would probably have been convicted; remember you called upon me to make this statement, and that there was a third person present, whose name I will give you if your memory fails.

“ I hope I shall not have to send a friend before I get an answer, as was the case with the former Letter.

“ I am, Sir, your most obedient servant,

“ WM. STOKES.

“ To Peter Alley, Esq.”

“ Golden-square, June 13, 1811.

“ SIR—I desire to have in the course of to-day, an answer to my Letter of Friday last, and apprise you, unless I receive a decisive answer, I shall adopt such measures as your conduct deserves.

“ To give the lie to the assertion set out in my Letter, I need only refer to your own conduct. In your reply upon the trial of the Indictment preferred by Col. Wardle, you said our future acquaintance must depend upon the credit the Jury gave to my evidence on that day. If there was any truth in the assertion before alluded to, is it possible you could have made such a statement as you did in the reply. You did not fail to inquire into any minute circumstance you had picked up amongst our mutual acquaintance; and will any person believe you would have omitted so material a one as that alluded to?—You cannot expect they will. After the trial you have personally, and through our mutual friends, endeavoured to renew our former acquaintance, and you know that was refused on my part. Can you expect any person will believe a man, “ who knows the respect due to himself,” would have courted the acquaintance of another who he believed to be perjured? You surely cannot believe it yourself, and I am sure no other person will.

“ I am, Sir, your most obedient servant,

“ WM. STOKES.

“ To Peter Alley, Esq.”

“ Golden-square, June 19th, 1811.

“ SIR—It is well known I was counsel for Col. Wardle, in his prosecution of Mrs. Clarke and others for a conspiracy; and though I had not the honour of that gentleman's acquaintance previously, I necessarily had many communications with him, in which, as it was my duty, I freely, and without reserve, stated in confidence every

thing I knew tending to assist his cause; and among other matters, mentioned declarations often and openly made to myself and others, as to the expectations entertained by Mr. Stokes, in consequence of what he called 'his efforts towards the restoration to power of his Royal Highness the Duke of York.'

"Communications thus made, I did not expect Col. Wardle to repeat, without my permission; I was therefore surprised to find it reported in a daily paper, as part of his speech on a late occasion, that I had told him 'Mr. Stokes had, at my table, made assertions contrary to his oath:' much more was I surprized shortly after at receiving a letter from Stokes, calling peremptorily on me to declare whether I had so said to Colonel Wardle or not. This I conceived Stokes had no right to demand; at least it seemed to me he should have first ascertained the fact, and not placed reliance on mere report. I therefore declined answering his letter, lest, by any possibility, I should involve my client in difficulty, and determined to take all responsibility on myself, until farther and more accurately informed.

"With this view I called on Colonel Wardle, feeling myself entitled to explanation from him. And here, much as I condemn his indiscretion on this occasion, yet it is but justice to him to state, that he did not hesitate to give every explanation in his power; and I have now before me a letter, in which he says that his speech was misrepresented, and that he did not use the expressions ascribed to him. His letter states, 'that he had been *informed* by a respectable character, that I had declared at a *public* dinner in the city that Stokes had made assertions contrary to the evidence he afterwards gave upon the trial.' Now, as I am not in the habit of attending public dinners or political meetings, this information



could not have been quite correct; and had Mr. Stokes taken the right course, by prudently applying for explanation where alone he could receive it correctly, I might have been spared the painful necessity of stating facts unpleasant to all parties.

As to my client, Colonel Wardle, I ought farther to say, that he assured me he did not intend to make the declaration in the House, without a previous communication with me on the subject, but that the suddenness of the occasion did not allow him to do so. However, although he could say no more, it was but a slender satisfaction to me, when the matter had been thus brought before the public, first by him, and afterwards by the rude and wanton statement of Stokes. Thus situated, I feel it a duty to my own character explicitly to state what I did say to Colonel Wardle.

I told him, and I now repeat it, that before Mrs. Clarke's trial, Stokes had often said to me and to others, without the least reserve, and with apparent boast, that he expected high promotion for his exertions towards restoring to power his Royal Highness the Duke of York: and he had gone so far as to declare he would not be content with any appointment for his services under the value of £2000 a-year; assigning, as his reason, that if he took a place, he must give up his business. How far this was true I know not; I merely state his assertions: nor shall I stop to inquire whether they are consistent with his evidence on the trial. Suffice it for me to say, I am FULLY prepared, by witnesses whose truth and honour cannot be impeached, to prove my assertions, and shall be ready to do it, when called upon in an authorised way. I therefore now leave the public to determine to whom the rude expression made by Stokes applies, of "false and scandalous."

In answering the statements contained in Mr. Stokes's letters, I cannot overlook that passage in which he would insinuate, that I sought his acquaintance from the unbecoming motive of obtaining business: this is however a bad compliment to himself; but to such ungenerous assertions, the independence of my professional life furnishes, I hope, the best answer.

My acquaintance with Mr. Stokes was casual: he married a lady long known to Mrs. Alley and myself—hence the intimacy arose; but, from the day of Mrs. Clarke's trial, my servants had orders to say we were engaged, should he call to visit us. At the same time I admit, that on meeting our mutual friends, I did not speak unkindly of him; it was not my wish to injure him; nothing but self defence could have urged me to the present public disclosure; and if by accident Mrs. Alley or myself had met him at a friend's house, I hope we should have remembered the respect due to our host: but I must add, we have deserted esteemed friends, because we knew they received his visits.

Again, he would dare insinuate I disclosed the secrets of my clients—shallow man! Does he forget that my client had himself most imprudently discovered every thing appertaining to his cause, on the motion for a new trial, and thus left no secret to disclose?

One observation more, and I have done. He concludes his letter of June 10 with this remarkable sentence: "I hope I shall not have to send a friend before I get an answer, as was the case with the former letter." Well said, brave man! So then, I was bullied into the answer. If his assertion be correct, the conclusion is against me; if untrue, what must people think of Mr. Stokes? I shall now state the fact, which is, that I neither saw any friend of his, nor did I hear from him through any personal commu-



nication, before he received my answer: if it is otherwise, the fact is recent, and Mr. Stokes can prove it.

Henceforth I shall not condescend to notice Mr. Stokes through any other medium than the law.

PETER ALLEY.

SIR—Mr. Alley having at length *condescended* to make an answer to my letter, has admitted that he did *not* make the assertion set out in my note of the 7th instant: and Colonel Wardle is represented by him as now stating, that he had only been *informed*, by a respectable character, that Mr. Alley had made the assertion at a *place* where Mr. Alley *denies having been!* It is therefore for the public to say, whether the assertion was not as *false* as it was *scandalous*.

It is a great pity that Colonel Wardle's speeches should always be so inaccurately reported as continually to require correction and explanation!—I hope, however, his letter was not written to Mr. Alley "*on the suddenness of the occasion*," as the speech is said to have been made; for if that is the case, and the gentlemen who reported the debate should refer to their notes, it may occasion *another* explanation and correction!!!

With respect to the assertion to which Mr. Alley has *put his name*, I cannot pretend to say, at the distance of two years, what may have passed in loose and jocular conversation after dinner: but I positively assert, that neither what Mr. Alley states, nor any thing like it was ever said by me in a serious manner, or as stating *a fact*, in the way Mr. Alley would insinuate to the public; and in addition to my denial, I have, most fortunately Mr. Alley's *own* opinion on the subject, when the conversation (if it ever occurred)



must have been fresh in his recollection, and which I shall prove by his conduct.

“ Mr. Alley, in his cross examination asked me, at the trial, whether I had had any communication with the Duke of York, or his solicitor, or had received any letter on the subject? Now, if he had heard such an assertion on my part, and believed it to have been *seriously uttered*, would not his next question have been, whether I had not such expectations as he mentions? Mr. Alley in his reply on the trial of the indictment said, ‘It is true that I have long known Mr. Stokes, nor *am I ashamed* of having known him, but it is unfair of the Attorney General to make out his case by adverting to the intimacy between us; I must speak freely of the individual with whom I have been in habits of intimacy, and your *verdict*, gentlemen, will decide *upon the future intercourse between us*. *If you find the Defendants guilty*, Mr. Stokes and myself shall know each other from this moment no more!’ — In another part of the same speech, Mr. Alley says, ‘of Mr. Stoke’s credibility I can say nothing; whether I shall *hereafter esteem him*, must depend upon your *verdict*!!’ Is this the language of a man possessed of the information he now pretends to have had, and who talks of having since given orders to say he was engaged if I called upon him? As I never went to his house, this must rest upon *his assertion*! but his conduct, *out of his house*, has been very different. Mr. Alley must recollect being in Cockspur-street, near Spring-gardens, last summer, *when he was not satisfied with speaking to me*, but waited until I had done talking to the gentleman with whom I was engaged, when he put his arm under mine, and walked with me almost to my own door! Is this like “accidentally meeting

at a friend's house?" and "*hoping* he *should* (not quite sure) have remembered the respect due to the host!" I repeat to Mr. Alley, that he has endeavoured to renew our former intimacy: and by saying, "he has not since spoken *unkindly* of me to mutual friends," he must allude to the conciliating messages which he *desired* might be delivered to me!

As Mr. Alley refers to the independence of his professional life, I have only to say that if he is disposed to have that subject gone into, I am quite ready for the discussion, and may, perhaps remind him of some occurrences which may alter opinions on that subject!

The Public will perceive it was Mr. Alley's own conduct that compelled me to publish our correspondence; and that if I had not so done, I should not have got a denial of Colonel Wardle's assertion put into the newspaper.\*

Surely that man must have arrived at the last extremity of human degradation, who records his cowardice in a public journal, by declaring his intention of sheltering himself beneath the shield of the law, when he had previously appealed to the opinion of the public! I did not originally wish for a discussion of this nature, but Mr. Alley having preferred it as the most *bloodless*, I shall not shrink from him on this ground; and he may be assured nothing will be done on my part, to prevent the public from forming an impartial judgment on our mutual conduct! A friend of mine called in the morning of the 10th at Mr. Alley's chambers, and being pressed by the clerk to leave his business, said it was with Mr. Alley

\* Mr. Alley's Letter, it must be recollected, was written expressly for public perusal, which was *not* the case with mine!

only, and as Mr. Alley was then at the Mansion-house, that he must see him in the evening, when he would call again. Some hours *after* this gentleman had called, Mr. Alley's answer was sent to my house (he has not explained how it came to be dated *two days* before), and this prevented my friend from immediately calling again.

Not getting an answer to my letter of Thursday the 13th, wherein I mentioned that "if I did not receive one in the course of the day, I should feel myself at liberty to adopt such measures as his conduct deserved," my friend called at Mr. Alley's chambers the next (Friday) morning, when the clerk asked him if he was the gentleman who had called on the Monday preceding? and having answered in the affirmative, he was shewn by the clerk into his own office, and after Mr. Alley had been apprised that he was waiting, was introduced to him and *another person*, whom Mr. Alley had taken care to have at his chambers, to be present at any conversation that might pass. Mr. Alley knew the gentleman to be a friend of mine (having met him at my house), and he asked him if he had called at his chambers on the *preceding Monday morning*? So that he *knew, when he wrote his address to the Public*, that a friend of mine had called upon him previously to his return from the Mansion-house, of which he had been apprised, and the letter he sent to me, from the time it was delivered, must have been *after* his return from the Mansion-house!

When my friend saw Mr. Alley, on Friday morning, the latter insisted that he could have no business with him, and the gentleman said that, on his own account, he had not, but that he had something particular to communicate, and that they must be alone. Mr. Alley said "he supposed he had come on Mr. Stokes's business,"



which he told him was the case, and that he would not communicate it in the presence of a third person. Mr. Alley then declared, he would neither avow nor disavow the assertion, and that if the gentleman came with any hostile message, or any thing like a challenge from Mr. Stokes, he was determined *to look to the law*; and if he (my friend) would deliver the message in the presence of Mr. Alley's friend, he might rest assured that he (Mr. Alley) would hold him blameless in the proceedings he should adopt against myself! My friend told him, he would not compromise his own safety by endangering that of a friend, and as Mr. Alley *had been so candid with him* in the declaration of the line of conduct he would adopt, he would be equally explicit by declaring, "it was impossible he should again wait on him!" This conversation being reported to me, I found I had to deal with a man *bold only in words*, and I was therefore compelled, as the *only satisfaction left me*, to submit our letters to the public.

I have only to add, that I never have, *directly or indirectly, received, or been promised to receive*, that I neither do expect, nor ever did expect, any *emolument, benefit, gift, reward, or patronage*, from His Royal Highness the Duke of York, or any of his family or friends, for any of the business in which I have been employed, either where the name of Colonel Wardle has been mentioned, or in any other business, or upon any other account whatever; and when Mr. Alley or his *associates* can find at any time hereafter, that I do obtain any such remuneration, I will allow them to declare that it was received for the corrupt purposes which he would cowardly insinuate!

I am, Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

WM. STOKES.

It is sufficiently evident that Mr. Stokes merely intended his two first letters as private communications to Mr. Alley; he cannot, therefore, be fairly blamed for publicly bringing forward circumstances connected with the immediate cause of this dispute, because the conduct of his antagonist subsequently compelled him to publish their correspondence; but Mr. Alley's reply being first addressed to the Editor of a newspaper admits of no such palliation; and we must severely censure him for betraying a private conversation, said to have taken place at the table of a mutual friend, and for making that which could obviously only have been jocularly intended, the subject of a serious public charge. Mr. Stokes's observations on this and on the subject of Mr. Alley's attempts to renew his intimacy, are so just and so convincing, that all comment on them would be superfluous; or we could ourselves recal certain circumstances to Mr. Alley's recollection that he must have forgotten when he wrote his letter to the Editor of the Times. We confess that we cannot see any wit in Mr. Alley's exclamations of "*shallow man!*" and "*brave man!*" nor do we think that Mr. Stokes would have been at all justified, if he had adopted the *latter* by way of *retort*. Colonel Wardle's propensity to falsehood and misrepresentation must now be considered as having been most satisfactorily proved by the evidence of his own counsel.

We cannot conclude this article without declaring, that Mr. Stokes, who was then defending us against the renowned action of Peter Finnerty, communicated to us the conversation to which he nine months after, justly swore he was privy, *half an hour after it had taken place between him and Colonel Wardle*, and we immediately mentioned the circumstance to an officer of the highest rank in the army. This was on the 7th of Feb. 1809, *during the investigation of the Duke of York's conduct* !!!

*The KING on the Prosecution of WILLIAM HALLETT,*  
*against*  
 GEORGE MANNERS.

HILARY TERM, 51st GEORGE III.

*Middlesex.*—BE IT REMEMBERED, that on Monday next after the octave of the purification of the Blessed Virgin Mary, in the 51st year of the reign of our Sovereign Lord George the Third, by the Grace of God of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland King Defender of the Faith, in the court of our said Lord the King before the King himself at Westminster, in the county of Middlesex, by the oath of twelve jurors good and lawful men of the said county of Middlesex, now here sworn and charged to enquire for our said Lord the King, for the body of the said county, IT IS PRESENTED as followeth: (that is to say), Middlesex; the jurors for our Lord the King upon their oath present, that George Manners, late of the parish of Saint Clement Dane, in the county of Middlesex gentleman, being a person of a malicious mind and disposition, and maliciously and unlawfully contriving and intending to injure, traduce, vilify, and defame William Hallett, Esquire, a good and peaceable subject of our said Lord the King, and to bring him into great and public contempt and disgrace among all the liege subjects of our said Lord the King, heretofore, to wit, on the first day of May, in the 49th year of the reign of our Sovereign Lord George the 3rd, by the Grace of God of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, King, Defender of the Faith, at the parish of Saint Clement Dane, in the county of Middlesex, maliciously and unlawfully did compose print and publish, and cause or procure to be composed, printed and published, a certain scandalous malicious and defamatory libel, of and concerning the said William Hallett; containing therein divers scandalous and malicious matters and things, of and concerning the said William Hallett,



according to the tenor and effect following, that is to say, HALLETT'S (meaning the said William Hallett's) HUMANITY. Sir, I perceive in list of Miss Taylor's subscribers, the name of a gentleman (meaning the said William Hallett) who (again meaning the said William Hallett) has recently purchased a large estate in the vicinity of Southampton; and to convince the public that humanity is not the motive of that ruined female's patrons, (meaning among other persons the said William Hallett) I wish to inform them, through the medium of the Satirist, that this liberal subscriber (meaning the said William Hallett) to her support, refused, a few weeks before, to advance an unoffending sister, (meaning a sister of the said William Hallett) who is with her husband a prisoner in the King's Bench the sum of 10*l.* to pay the physician's fees who was then attending her in a dangerous illness, although he (meaning the said William Hallett) had it in his power to repay himself, being her trustee. She, alas! is a virtuous woman, and therefore, though his sister, must not expect to receive any assistance from the benevolent and patriotic Mr. Hallett (meaning the said William Hallett); to the great scandal infamy and disgrace and damage of the said William Hallett, in contempt of our said Lord the King and his laws, to the evil example of all others, and against the peace of our said Lord the King, his crown and dignity. [2nd Count]. And the jurors aforesaid, upon their oath aforesaid, do further present that the said George Manners being such person as aforesaid, and unlawfully and maliciously contriving and intending as aforesaid afterwards to wit, on the 2nd day of October in the 50th year of the Reign aforesaid, at the parish of Saint Clement Dane, in the county of Middlesex, maliciously and unlawfully did publish and cause to be published, a certain other scandalous malicious and defamatory libel, of and concerning the said William Hallett, containing therein divers scandalous and malicious matters and things, of and concerning the said William Hallett, according to the tenor and effect following, to wit, HALLETT'S (meaning the said William Hallett) HUMANITY. Sir, I perceive in the list of Miss Taylor's subscribers the name

of a gentleman (meaning the said William Hallett) who (meaning the said William Hallett) has recently purchased a large estate in the vicinity of Southampton, and to convince the public that humanity is not the motive of that ruined female's patrons, I wish to inform them, through the medium of the Satirist, that this liberal subscriber (meaning the said William Hallett) to her support, refused, a few weeks before, to advance an unoffending sister, (meaning a sister of the said William Hallett) who is with her husband a prisoner in the King's Bench, the sum of 10*l*. to pay the physician's fees who was then attending her in a dangerous illness; although he (meaning the said William Hallett) had it in his power to repay himself, being her trustee. She, alas! is a virtuous woman, and therefore, though his (meaning the said William Hallett) sister, must not expect to receive any assistance from the benevolent and patriotic Mr. Hallett (meaning the said William Hallett); to the great scandal infamy and disgrace of the said William Hallett, in contempt of our said Lord the King, and his laws, to the evil example of all others, and against the peace of our said Lord the King, his crown and dignity. [3rd Count.] And the jurors aforesaid, upon their oath aforesaid, do further present that the said George Manners so being such person as aforesaid, and unlawfully and maliciously contriving and intending as aforesaid heretofore, to wit, on the 1st day of September in the 50th year of the Reign aforesaid, at the parish of Saint Clement Dane, in the county of Middlesex, maliciously and unlawfully, did compose, print and publish, and cause to be composed, printed and published, a certain other scandalous and malicious libel, of and concerning the said William Hallett, containing therein divers scandalous and malicious matters and things, of and concerning the said William Hallett, according to the tenor and effect following, to wit: It may not be unnecessary to state who these charitable gentlemen are, and we are fortunately enabled by a friend, to do so most correctly. The original promoter of this business was Hallet the dog butcher (meaning the said Mr. Hallett), a man as tyrannical and litigious in his disposition as our student, who (meaning the said Wm. Hallett)

having a dispute about a field with a neighbouring gentleman, in whose family he (meaning the said William Hallett) was (while supposed a respectable character) extremely intimate, ordered his keeper to shoot a favourite lap dog which belonged to the infant and only son of his neighbour and to lay it in its wounded state in a situation where the child was sure to see it. Noble revenge! This Hallett (meaning the said William Hallett) out of gratitude (if gratitude can dwell in such a breast) to Cobbet for writing speeches for him to deliver at the Berkshire and other meetings, called upon him while he was in the King's Bench, but never enquired for his (meaning the said William Hallett's) own sister, who with her husband is confined for a trifling debt in the same prison, a debt of considerably less amount than the money which is due to them from Hallett, (meaning the said William Hallett) for the board of a daughter, and which he (meaning the said William Hallett) most shamefully refuses to pay! The husband an officer in the army met this idiot patriot (meaning the said William Hallett) on his return from Cobbet's apartments, and almost frightened him and his son out of their wits, they both however submitted to every degrading epithet which their conduct merited; the father (meaning the said William Hallett) having promised to give satisfaction, but when called upon by a friend of his injured brother-in-law cowardly declined the meeting which he had himself offered, in order to escape summary chastisement, to the great infamy scandal disgrace and damage of the said William Hallett, in contempt of our said Lord the now King and his laws, to the evil example of all others, and against the peace of our said Lord the King his crown and dignity. [4th Count.] And the jurors aforesaid upon their oath aforesaid do further present that the said George Manners so being such person as aforesaid and further unlawfully and maliciously contriving and intending as aforesaid, heretofore, to wit, on the 2d day of October in the 50th year of the reign aforesaid, at the parish of St. Clement Danes in the county of Middlesex, maliciously and unlawfully did publish and cause to be published a certain other scandalous



And malicious libel of and concerning the said William Hallett containing therein divers scandalous and malicious matters and things of and concerning the said William Hallett according to the tenor and effect following, that is to say, It may not be unnecessary to state who these charitable gentlemen are, and we are fortunately enabled by a friend to do so most correctly. The original promoter of the business was Hallet the dog butcher (meaning the said William Hallett a man as tyrannical and litigious in his disposition as our student) who (meaning the said William Hallett) having a dispute about a field with a neighbouring gentleman in whose family he was (while supposed a respectable character) extremely intimate, ordered his keeper to shoot a favourite lap dog which belonged to the infant and only son of his (meaning the said William Hallett's) neighbour, and to lay it in its wounded state in a situation where the child was sure to see it. Noble revenge! This Hallet (meaning the said William Hallett) out of gratitude (if gratitude can dwell in such a breast) to Cobbet for writing speeches for him to deliver at the Berkshire and other meetings called upon him while he was in the K. B. but never enquired for his (meaning the said William Hallett's) own sister, who with her husband is confined for a trifling debt in the same prison, a debt of considerably less amount than the money which is due to them from Hallett (meaning the said William Hallett) for the board of a daughter and which he (meaning the said William Hallett) most shamefully refuses to pay! The husband an officer in the army met this idiot patriot (meaning the said William Hallett) on his return from Cobbett's apartments and almost frightened him and his son out of their wits, they both however submitted to every degrading epithet which their conduct merited; the father (meaning the said William Hallett) having promised to give satisfaction but when called upon by a friend of his injured brother-in-law, cowardly declined the meeting which he had himself offered in order to escape summary chastisement, to the great scandal infamy disgrace and damage of the said William Hallett, in contempt of our said Lord the now King and his laws, to the evil example of

all others and against the peace of our said Lord the King his crown and dignity.

EDMUND GILL

BENJAMIN TABART

CHARLES STALKER

WILLIAM HALLETT,

the younger.

} Witness.\*

All sworn in Court.

*On Saturday, June 1st, the preceding indictment came on to be tried before the Right Honourable Lord Ellenborough, at Westminster Hall.*

MR. GASELEE opened the case for the prosecution, and MR. PARK addressed the jury nearly in the following words:—

“ May it please your lordships, gentlemen of the jury, my learned friend has stated to you the nature of this indictment. It appears, that Mr. Manners has thought proper for the space of two years, to persevere in libelling my client in the grossest and most unwarrantable manner. Mr. Hallett, the prosecutor, is a gentleman of large fortune, and a magistrate, who formerly lived at Town Hill, near Southampton. I am very sure gentlemen, that the learned gentleman who is counsel for the defendant, will not attempt to infringe upon that rule, which has been so recently and so properly laid down by this court, and that whatever may be his instructions,† he will not think of bringing forward fresh libels against my client, in justification of that which is now the subject of complaint.

\* It is to be observed, that not one of the witnesses, with the exception of EDMUND GILL, who merely proved having purchased the book at a book-seller's shop, appeared as witnesses at the trial—nor could any one of them have proved MR. MANNERS'S connection with THE SATIRIST.

† Our instructions to Mr. Garrow were, “to use his own discretion;” of which we always had, and still have, a very high opinion.

I shall, gentlemen, read the different paragraphs, and I am very sure that there will be no doubt in your minds, as to their nature and tendency, and that you will, by your verdict, pronounce them to be libellous."—Here the learned counsel read the articles set out in the indictment, and commented upon them with great ingenuity. Messrs Flint and Skackle, printers of the *Satirist*, proved that they had the MS. of the libel from Mr. Manners.

MR. GARROW then rose, on the part of the defendant, and spoke to the following effect :—" May it please your lordships, gentlemen of the jury, it is now my duty to address you on the part of Mr. Manners, who is a gentleman of education and respectability.—I really am, gentlemen, and I told Mr. Manners so at a private conference, one of the worst persons in the world, to defend an action of this description. Gentlemen, I will not stupify myself by telling you that the publication complained of, is not a libel, for if I were, his lordship on the bench would tell you that it was. Mr. Manners has suffered his feelings to get the better of his prudence in a political discussion, and has introduced circumstances of a private nature relative to Mr. Hallett, which he certainly was not justified in doing.—I wish, gentlemen, that the severe punishments which this court has justly deemed it necessary to inflict, would prevent this species of writing altogether; but I am sorry to say, this does not appear likely to be the case. It is impossible for me to say, that Mr. Hallett may not have been justified in refusing assistance to his sister; for, gentlemen, we all know that there are many circumstances which may oblige a man to withdraw his affection and protection, even from his nearest relatives. Gentlemen, I am compelled to admit, that a verdict must go against my client.

LORD ELLENBOROUGH then recapitulated the evidence, commenting with his usual acuteness on the subjects



of the indictment, and very justly observed, that ~~it~~ must be pronounced grossly libellous. The jury of course found the defendant *guilty*!

On Thursday, June 27th, the defendant was brought up to receive the judgment of the court, when no affidavits being offered on either side, Mr. Manners proceeded to address the court in nearly the following terms:—

May it please your Lordships,

Circumstances, which cannot with propriety be publicly stated, have compelled me most reluctantly to address those observations to your Lordships personally, which would otherwise have been much more eloquently, and more ably stated, by the learned counsel who defended me at my trial; but my lords, in making these observations I shall not, I trust, forget the situation in which I have the misfortune to stand, and I am sure I shall not forget that respect which is so justly due to this honourable court. If through ignorance of its usages, I should be guilty of any irregularity, your lordships will point it out, and my error shall be instantly corrected.

I am to receive the judgment of your lordships for a libel, of which I have been found guilty on evidence, if not unimpeachable, most certainly unimpeached; and if that libel admitted of no explanation, if it were to be merely considered as it stands on the record unconnected with other circumstances, my conduct would indeed appear worthy of that exemplary punishment, which your lordships have been called upon to inflict, and which I sincerely hope, will ever be the lot of those who are actuated by motives of private malice, or who willingly become the instruments of another's malignity.—My lords, such motives I from the bottom of my soul disclaim. Although I have the honour of being acquainted with several most respectable persons, who were his friends and neighbours, Mr. Hallett is not even personally known to me, and if

he had not challenged my attention by his public conduct; if he had not, by publicly arraigning the characters of the most illustrious individuals in the kingdom, virtually invited an investigation of his own; if he had not for political purposes, become the public rewarder of a——, of Miss Taylor, and the abettor of the most mischievous and most seditious libellers that have disgraced the British press; I should have been one of the last men in the world to intrude upon his privacy. I am aware, my lords, that Mr. Hallett's conduct cannot be legally deemed a justification of my own; but, my lords, as the *quo animo* of a libel may be urged in aggravation of the offence, so I humbly conceive that it may be pleaded in mitigation of punishment, and my object is to shew the real motives which induced me to cause the first libel in the indictment to be published, and to write the second.

From the evidence which was given at my trial your Lordships may be led to suppose that my connection with the periodical press is much more intimate and extensive than is really the case. It is true that I am a proprietor, and was the original planner of the *Satirist*; but, my lords, numerous articles have been inserted in that Work which had never previously come under my inspection; and if they had, many of them most certainly never would have been inserted. It was given in evidence that there was an office where the *Satirist* was published, and this was stated in such a manner, as to create a belief that I resided, or, at least, daily attended at this office: whereas, in fact, I scarcely visit the place above twice or three times in the course of the month. Indeed, at the time the libel in the indictment was published, the house was not built, and a bookseller residing in Leadenhall street was the publisher of the *Satirist*, and had been so since the commencement of the Work.

My lords, the libel contained in the first count of the indictment was forwarded to me by the publisher of the *Satirist*, who received it through the medium of the *General Post*. Before I consented to have this anonymous communication published, I made every possible exertion to ascertain the truth or falsehood of its contents, and with that view, went over personally to the *King's Bench* to make the necessary enquiries. From the lips of the lady herself, (who, still being extended on the couch of sickness), I was assured that every syllable was strictly true."

Here Mr. Parke interfered, and said that the defendant had no right to make this declaration, as he had brought forward no affidavits, and that in consequence of this he (Mr. P.) had refrained from offering any on the part of the prosecution. The Court agreed in the justice of Mr. Parke's observation, and humanely cautioned the defendant against introducing matter which might be deemed an aggravation of his offence.

Mr. Manners thanked the Court for their advice, and observed, that he by no means meant to *justify* what had been published, but to shew the impression under which he acted at the moment. "My feelings" continued he, "were now doubly interested. The nature of those feelings it would, perhaps, at this moment, be improper to state; but I trust your lordships will do me the justice to believe, that they were neither inspired by malice nor tinged with malignity. My lords, in causing this letter to be published, I acted upon principles which had been inculcated by an authority which Mr. Hallett ought to be the last man to question; for it was the authority of the *abettor* and contriver of the present *jail-engendered prosecution*."

Here Mr. Manners offered to read an extract from the



author to whom he alluded, but the Court humanely interfered, and warned him to beware, lest that which he was about to read should be improper to be offered in mitigation. Observing, that it was very seldom that defendants took the advice of the Court, whose only object could be to prevent them from injuring their own cause. Mr. Manners replied, that "although the extract he was about to read contained nothing offensive, he had too high a respect for the Court to reject their humane advice." And after he had recovered from the confusion and kind interruption, proceeded thus: "I trust, my lords, that the Court will make a just distinction between my case and that of the false and malignant libeller of defenceless innocence, and that your lordships will regard my offence as in some degree resembling that of a man who commits a trespass on his neighbour's lands, with the view of rescuing his flocks and herds from the ravages of vermin!"

Mr. Parke then rose in reply, and spoke with great animation in aggravation of punishment. His speech was pointedly severe, and his remarks ingeniously acute; but, at the same time, most fair and most gentlemanly. We regret that the necessity of getting our Work to press immediately prevents us from giving it at length. SIR NASH GROSE then proceeded to pass sentence, and made some severe observations on the necessity of punishing libels, and on the evil tendency of such publications, in all of which we most cordially agree. And we are thoroughly convinced both of the justice of the verdict and of the propriety of the sentence; which was, "That Mr. Manners should be committed to the King's Bench for *three months*, and be bound over to keep the peace for three years, himself in 500*l.* and two sureties in 200*l.* each."

P. S. We must defer all comment till next month, and having acknowledged the justice of the sentence, we shall only add, that, notwithstanding the inconveniences of imprisonment, Mr. Manners cannot lament; that for applying the *professed principles* of the *reforming patriots* to *themselves*, he should thus have become a victim *illustrative of their PRACTICE!*

## REVIEW OF NEW PUBLICATIONS.

---

FIAT JUSTITIA !

---

*On the Powers and Duties of Juries, and on the Criminal Laws of England.* By Sir Richard Phillips. Sherwood, Neely and Jones, Paternoster Row, 1811.

---

(Concluded from No. 44. p. 442.)

WE now resume our inquisitorial labours in bringing up Sir Richard's doughty production before our critical court ; though we believe it is a power whose jurisdiction he has found it convenient to deny ; but not before he had given up his connection with that *pie poudre* court of summary and *anonymous* decision, the *Oxford Review* ! As for the work itself it reminds us of the savage necklaces of the Indian Ocean, whose pearls and cockleshells are indiscriminately strung together ; the pearls indeed are not the *stringer's*, but we will allow him a full property in the *more* worth-less article, (to use a common though perhaps not strictly a correct phrase) and to that portion of the work we shall direct our attention. As for the pearls which he has selected from the best authorities, *they* are certainly incontrovertible in themselves, though not always so as the civic, we had almost said *civil*, knight has contrived to apply them ; but we must confess that as his book is more intended to tell jurors what *ought* to

be *Law* and *Practice*, than what really is so, those who wish to obey the law as it stands, will be safest in not considering Sir Richard's aphorisms, either as *Law* or *Gospel*.

If his ignorant worshippers, for some such fools there may be, could read Latin, they might perhaps be led astray by his quotation from *Magna Charta*, as a motto, as he himself seems to have been; but we must tell him that even in the days of signing *Magna Charta*, men might be imprisoned, and otherwise punished, *without the intervention of a Jury*. Summary punishments were then directed by the law, and if we did not know the historical fact, it might be logically deduced even from the knight's quotation,—“*Nullus liber homo capiatur, &c.—nisi per legale judicium parium suorum vel per legem terræ;*” which clearly marks the distinction between trial, and conviction by jury, and more summary proceeding conducted by the magistrates or *various courts*, according to the established law. If indeed the word *vel* had been “*et*,” then the reasonings of Sir Francis, Sir Richard, and their *novinscient* friends *might* have some little appearance of accuracy on which to found their *newfangled* opinions.

But there are none so obstinate as those who promulgate their oracular decisions on subjects to which they are incompetent; and as Sir Richard in his *apology*, for even he requires an apology, tells us that he has no better one than having served on several juries both grand and petit, and having summoned some whilst sheriff, we think if he had added *qualification* to “*apology*,” he would have been but giving us a fair statement of the case, for as to his research into law authorities, it is evident that his opinions were formed before ever he applied to them. It may be a *popular* assertion that the “*Jury system is a non-profes-*



sional subject," and to be guided only by the dictates of common sense, without, as he boasts, any reference to law authority and practice; yet before he has got to page 46, he forgets this aphorism, and condescendingly offers us as a guide, *his own practice* when he filled the office of sheriff! Like all other self-elected legislators, he blunders at that maxim of our law "that every man is supposed innocent until he is found guilty," an axiom of circumscribed extent, meaning merely that the man (in a negative sense) is *not* guilty until found so; but he asserts that the law "presumes every thing in favour of accused persons," as if they were affirmatively virtuous and oppressed characters, and indeed, from the whole tenor of the book, though he says "that his sole object has been to impress jurymen with just views," we fear that those who adopt it as their guide, will be more remarkable for their opposition to justice, than for "the legal and honest performance of their duties." We deprecate that system of modern liberality which holds up the *felon* and the *debtor* as the injured parties.

But the most *presumptuous* part of this work is that where he plainly tells us that he has avoided or "*evaded*" every thing about the origin of juries, and "states a broad hypothesis sufficient for *his* general purposes" (undoubtedly) and that he "*presumes*" they appertained to the Celts and Goths—and this *presumption* he calls an "historical fact"!!! So that whatever this *literary Emperor* "*presumes*" to decree, must be taken as an undoubted fact, on which the whole theory and practice of our Law Courts are to be founded!!! His apostrophe to Englishmen respecting British liberty, is no doubt very fine, and is indeed founded on principles just in themselves, but *very* different from the principles inculcated in a book which he was once accused of selling — a circumstance which perhaps makes him so very tender

respecting *printers* and *publishers*, and so anxious to impress upon the minds of jurors that *they* can do no wrong, or at least only in proportion to their profits; so that if a bookseller was to *give away* Paine's Rights of Man, he ought not to be punishable for a misdemeanor.

But this judicial knight-errant seems most annoyed by the lawyers, whom he accuses of being ambitious of being constant friends to power and prerogative, and not attached to popular influence; but strange to say, amongst those whom he describes as neither expecting nor obtaining preferment, he names two who held high offices under the late administration, one of whom now sits in a higher place, and the other, *like himself*, was knighted. Will he indeed tell us that men who adopt the *popular* side,—though we cannot always conscientiously call it the side of the people—will he tell us that those men expect nothing from popular favor, or that crowding briefs are not as acceptable as, nay, more lucrative than, the smiles of a court? But Englishmen will be no more deceived by those specious assertions, than they will be *humbugged* by the sophistical claptrap that “Law is declared to be nothing more than the perfection of common sense; and as the mass of Englishmen are permanently gifted with this quality,” (amongst whom we should be pre-eminently happy to rank the worthy knight) “whatever may be their habits, or acquired knowledge, Juries may be assured that they are as competent to decide fully and correctly on all questions *by the powers* of their heads and hearts, as they are by the powers of the constitution”!

But we hasten from the proposed order of our analysis to present this literary cavalier, or cavalier author, to our readers, in his new form of a legislator, or of a maker, as well as an explainer, of laws; in which character, doubtless, he expects some future *Strass* will leave him floating

on the "Stream of Time," in company with Solon and Lycurgus, who certainly are *not to be compared to him!*

In this *Philippian Code* now first promulgated, there are indeed too many good things, to do justice to each in the limited compass of our half sheet; but our readers may form an idea of the rational practicability of the scheme, by a slight examination of some of the *notanda*, and of their probable consequences. With respect to the learned knight's *consistency*, the very second article in his *Egregious*, but not *Egerian*, Code, (for we believe no *nymph* assisted him in its patchwork, unless some of his domestic neighbour Mrs. B.——'s nymphs assisted in the stitching) gives us a *flaming* proof, where he says "punish *anti-social* crimes of that degree which now involves death, *with expatriation for life*:" and again, in page 293, in the 11th article "there ought to be no transportation except for life:" yet, in page 298 he says, "I have alluded to the *cruelty* of rendering *all transportations perpetual*, by sending the victims to the antipodes," (a new name for Botany Bay, bye-the-bye, something like Cobbett's *State Prison* in Newgate) "when it is impossible for them to return at the expiration of their sentences." But his grand scheme to preserve the order of society is in the 9th article of his *Exposé*, where he tells us that in some extraordinary cases "the Scriptural doctrine of personal retribution, of an eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth, might be enforced in regard to *forgeries, rapes, and some other gross offences*"—Nay, start not *gentle* reader, it is even so, and in page 292 you will find it thus written. Now if this retributory law is applicable to *forgeries*, we presume it is equally so to all other *bill transactions*, of course in a late case of the author himself, which he very feelingly alludes to in page 204, &c. if the jury had not given him the verdict on the point of law, which he ac-



knowledges they were very unwilling to do, he might have made reprisals *by the creation of a little new paper* equally good, and as *legally* stamped, as that in the hands of "Messrs. Shylock and Co."; an appellation which certain bankers will know how to appreciate; but for the *second* specified retribution,—Goddess of Modesty! whether arrayed in heavenly, or disarrayed in fashionable costume—whether personified under the modest attire and tempting straw hat of one of those habiliment-making nymphs, who now inhabit that *manufactory* from whence so many hot-pressed editors in sheets have issued forth, or disguised under the more *spirited* form of one of those ambulatory goddesses, who, under the friendly shade of night, pedestrianize on the margin of that hallowed stream which meanders in front of the *late* chivalric mansion—whatever shape thou mayest please to assume, teach us to analyse this ticklish aphorism without blushing, or have the goodness to lend your fan to our readers!—That the execution of this part of the law might be the most agreeable part of a sheriff's duty, no doubt Sir Richard will agree with us, or that a father or a brother, or even a husband, might be inclined to take reciprocal vengeance, is possible; but how this is to satisfy an aggrieved individual who has no male relative to claim retribution, unless the lady should be permitted to take satisfaction herself on the aggressor, we know not; it is however too ticklish an affair for us to take in hand, nor shall we attempt to go to the bottom of it, but proceed with modest haste to investigate some other great ideas of this forgiving legislator, whose tender laws ought neither to be written on brass like the twelve tables, nor on stone like the Mosaic decalogue, but on some substance equally soft as themselves! from the knight's head they have sprung forth, like Minerva from the head of Jove, let them then be imprinted on the under crust of some

gooseberry-pie equal in flavour to that wherewith his tender heart was first assailed, according to that biography which, under his own patronage, blazoned forth his honours and his virtues to an admiring world!

Sir Richard has given us *his* ideas upon libel; but it is extraordinary how even *his* principles and practice differ. It is not many months since several attempts were made to bring the Satarist into court, which he perhaps remembers; but perhaps the *Satirist* is the *exception* to which he alludes in page 256, where he says "if the libel was published in an *unusual form* or manner, and *out of the course of business*, or in any *periodical* work often charged with *libels*; or if knowing the author, he refuses to give him up, the jury have evidences on which to found **STRONG PRESUMPTIONS OF GUILT!!!**" and this too, after having repeatedly told his readers, that as jurors, they had nothing to do with *presumptions* of guilt, but to acquit where there was not positive evidence. From this however we may draw those deductions; that a libel done in the *usual* way, and in the *way of business*, is no libel at all, but that a *periodical* work which has been *often charged*, no matter whether falsely or not, *must certainly be guilty!!!* He may perhaps be desirous of denying these deductions; and indeed he seems to have been conscious that some curious ones might be drawn from his work: he therefore very kindly gives his *illogical* readers *his* deductions at the end; but he seems to have overlooked one or two which are deserving of remembrance. For instance, he tells us in page 279, that *hard work and little for it* "does not accord with the sanguine or *choleric* temperament of some, and disgusted with hard work their only alternative is *thieving*." Now, no man we are told can sooner put himself in a passion than the worthy Knight, yet who would suspect him of being addicted to the above alterna-

tive? He therefore cannot mean to apply it to himself; nor even to his own *literary journeymen*, who may perhaps have sometimes been in the first predicament! He may, however, perhaps tell us that our deduction is a *non-sequitur*: we shall therefore close this article with noticing one or two points which require a little elucidation, and which he may be perhaps disposed to explain in some future edition.

In page 71, speaking of a grand jury, he says "in striking them, it is customary to summon none but such as have the joint additions to their names of *Esquire* and *Freeholder*." Now, as Sir Richard more than once says, we "humbly presume" that *Esquire* and *Freeholder* are not synonymous, and as every man with a decent coat to his back now claims the title, (even D'Egville at the Opera-house lately assumed it, nay we believe Sir Richard himself made some pretensions to it, before his Knighthood,) we will thank him to explain what is meant by *Esquire*, as otherwise the term is so general as to put even *Jews* upon a grand jury.

Again in his queries to juries, page 249, he demands "Would not a benefit arise to the public if the conduct of the public functionary accorded with the spirit of the alleged libel?" In reply to which we ask him what benefit could possibly have arisen to the public if a noble Secretary of State had actually been guilty of those atrocities ascribed to him by a present inhabitant of Lincoln Jail; or would Britain be any happier if the weekly libels of the *Newgate Student* against all that is great or good in the empire were actually founded in truth! Indeed if the country would be benefited by the truth of their censure, it follows that it must now be *damned* by those whom *they praise*! To those who are at the trouble of wading through this work, it is curious



to observe how *feelingly* some parts of it are written. With all his love for the liberty of the press, he is very anxious, like other modern admirers of it, to regulate what ought and what ought not to be published; and with respect to courts of law observes, that "the speeches of the counsel, and particularly their interrogatories, often insinuate libels on the parties and the witnesses, and ought seldom or never to receive publicity, much less to be recognized as matter of useful or commendable information." Now we "humbly conceive" that *every man* is not liable to be injured even by the cross-examination in either Westminster or Guildhalls. *He* must have rendered himself conspicuous indeed, who is liable to be hit by every bolt that is thrown at random. We have heard, however, that the foregoing axiom has already been tried in practice, and that the speeches of counsel on a late trial were sedulously kept back in more than one daily publication.

We shall now close our review of this precious *morceau* in doing our duty to the public, by advising them to be on their guard against the sophistical reasonings which, in many parts, are attempted to be founded on false analogies. Who indeed, in their sober senses, would believe that a *publisher* of a libel, is exactly like the *proprietor* of a stage coach which oversets and breaks the limb of a passenger—but *Ohe jam satis!*

## COMPARATIVE CRITICISM.

*Non nostrum inter vos TANTAS componere lites!*—

VIRGIL.

*Who shall decide when DOCTORS disagree?*—

POPE.

1. Mathematics simplified, &c. ; by Captain Thomas Williamson.

“—If however the work does not answer completely to the title, *many useful hints* are interspersed which will be *of service to the practical mathematician.*”—Annual Review.

“Though this work may not much advance the progress of science, it is *well calculated to enrich mechanical operators*, with ideas gained from pure science. Every thing is formed in consistency with this plan. The DIRECTIONS are so CLEAR and simple that an unlearned person cannot misapprehend them. The ideas derived from pure geometry cannot be too extensively made known ; and captain Williamson seems to have taken a *good method of diffusing* such ideas.”—British Critic.

“That this book can be *serviceable to mechanics*, or more serviceable than other previous publications, we are *not* inclined to think ; but for the use of such as mean to proceed in the study of mathematics, we are decidedly of opinion that it is calculated to *retard*, if not *prevent*, their future progress.—Upon this definition we must be allowed to make two remarks, which will apply to *numerous passages* where the same *want of judgment* is discernible.—After the definitions follow the geometrical problems : of which our limits will allow us to observe only, that the constructions of the greater part are, as indeed they ought to be, merely compiled ; and that those which are not compiled,

are the *very worst we ever met with*. They are *ill-arranged, they want order and method*," &c. "It would be a *tedious*, as well as an ungrateful task, to point out the *vagueness, inaccuracies, and improprieties* of the language. But these defects of language, however highly to be censured in an elementary book, yet are of less importance than actual *errors in fact and principle*, which, either through *carelessness or ignorance*, captain Williamson has fallen into."—Critical Review.

"Instead of '*Mathematics Simplified*,' the valiant author would have shewn more wisdom and honesty if he had pitched on some appropriate title; such as '*Mathematics perplexed*,' or '*Mathematics misrepresented*,' or '*Mathematics misunderstood*,' or '*Mathematics degraded*:' and we would seriously recommend one or other of these to his adoption, should any of his friends advise a new edition of the title-page. We should conjecture that captain Williamson designed to give, in this book, a few problems in practical geometry; but the nature of his production makes it quite certain, that the contents of his *cranium* were *woefully confused* while he was employed in executing his intention. Our author's treatise on surveying we do *not* profess to *understand*; for his DIRECTIONS are VERY OBSCURE. But we must dwell no longer on such *trash*. We blame not the captain for his *ignorance*; in itself it would be an object of compassion, and especially if connected with docility and modesty: but the *arrogant airs, and pretensions to authorship*, of an *ignorant man*, are just objects of condemnation."—Eclectic Review,

---

2. Solomon, a Sacred Drama; translated from the German of Klopstock, by Robert Huish.

"With regard to the present volume, we *scarcely think* that Mr. Huish has selected the *most interesting* of Klopstock's sacred Dramas."—Universal Magazine,

"This play is *dull beyond toleration*; and although Solomon himself had written it, none but *Job* could have perused it



throughout with a perfect *command of temper*."—Monthly Review.

"This is one of the *most interesting* of the dramatic compositions of Klopstock. There are some *very fine* scenes and passages, worked up with *great pathos* and represented with *much effect*. The anguish of the mothers, &c. "are amongst the *happiest productions* of the kind.—As to the *translation*, we should be glad to be able to speak in *more favourable* terms of its execution than we feel ourselves *justified* to do."—British Critic.

"With respect to Mr. Huish's *translation*, the task is most arduous, and the translator appears to have both *talents* and resolution for the undertaking.—Antijacobin Review.

"The *translation* is executed with *ability*."—Critical Review.

3. Two Letters to "a Barrister;" containing Strictures on his Work in three Parts, entitled "Hints to the Public and the Legislature on the Nature and Effect of Evangelical Preaching:" by a Looker-on.

"This author entered upon his task with many advantages, and some of them peculiar to himself; with a *vigorous* and *cultivated mind*, with considerable observation of life, and with an attachment to genuine religion, not derived from early prepossessions, but from the candid examination of a *mature understanding*. He has produced a *temperate, rational, concise, and satisfactory* answer to nearly all the Barrister's misrepresentations. We select two paragraphs, as a specimen of his *neat and conclusive* manner."—Eclectic Review.

"If we did not know the very great liberties which the priests of this sect take with the docility of their disciples, we should consider such a *gross* attempt at a defence as this is, as an *insult* on the *common sense* of their readers. Really these anti-moralists, as they are very justly termed, seem to *set both religion and reason* equally at defiance."—Critical Review.

4. A Narrative of the Campaign of the British Army in Spain, commanded by His Excellency Lieutenant General Sir John Moore, K. B.; by James Moore, Esq.

§. "But for the *discernment, vigilance, and talents*, displayed by sir John Moore, the army would have been overpowered," &c. "*Praises of the highest kind* are clearly due to his character and conduct."—British Critic.

"Sir John Moore appears *not* to have been *inferior* to any officer in the British service, in *military skill*.—This work places the character of sir John Moore in a *very amiable and interesting* point of view."—Critical Review, and Appendix.

"The *talents and virtues* of sir John Moore, his *accurate knowledge* of his profession, his *high sense of honour*, and his *gallant spirit*, have been universally acknowledged."—Quarterly Review.

"It is not the last scene of sir John Moore's triumph alone, that will claim the lasting regards of England. She will proudly remember that his *judgment and skill* were only surpassed by his unconquerable valour; she will fondly dwell upon that matchless *self-denial* which subjected all his interests to her weal; she will hold him up to her most famous warriors in after-times, as a bright example of that *entire forbearance*, that *utter extinction* of every *selfish feeling*, that high and manly *sacrifice* of the highest and manliest of passions, that *severe mortification* of *ambition* itself," &c.—Edinburgh Review.

"[Quotation from one of sir John's letters.] It is scarcely possible to conceive any reasoning more *silly* than the above. Nothing but the *blindness and imbecile judgment* of *inordinate pride* could have suggested," &c.—"In this manner we see sir John attempting most *awkwardly* to *imitate Buonaparte*: his *supercilious and narrow-minded ambition* was only directed to *enhance his own authority*; *envious and jealous* of the fame and talents possessed by many of those officers who have literally

§ The recurrence of this mark, §., denotes the different classes in which the extracts are arranged, according to their particular subjects.

been the soul of the Spanish war against Buonaparte, he sought to deprive them at once of their character and their influence, by propagating those *base insinuations* which are engendered only in *ignoble minds*. An *impotent* and *ignorant* attempt is also made to depreciate their talents, as well as their moral character, without any pretext whatever for such *groundless insinuations*. But without stopping to rebut these *invidious calumnies*, we may be permitted," &c.—Antijacobin Review.

§. "The English general appears to have *done all which* in his situation it *was wise* to attempt."—Critical Review."

"The situation in which sir John Moore was placed, was certainly most arduous. But to *arrogate* the claim of *wisdom*, for protracted hesitation, is, we think, *extremely injudicious*."—Quarterly Review.

§. Mr. Frere seems to have calculated like a sort of *political Quixote*, on the *enthusiasm* of the country; when, except in one or two remote points, the whole peninsula hardly emitted a single scintillation of enthusiasm."—Critical Review.

"If it be intended, as apparently it is, to criminate or to *ridicule Mr. Frere's* ardent attachment to the cause of Spanish independence, and his backwardness to despair of its success, it would be base and unworthy in us to abstain from *justifying* and *applauding* sentiments in which we claim with Mr. Frere a full participation. We confess that we have *faith* in Mr. Frere's *judgment*, even though we allow that the spectacle of a great nation struggling for its political independence had power to warm him into *enthusiasm*."—Quarterly Review.

§. "This Narrative contains a *fair*, circumstantial, and *accurate* account, of the campaign of Sir John Moore on the Peninsula."—Critical Review (Appendix).

"We must protest against the *disposition* which manifests itself in *almost every page* of this work, to *elevate* Sir John Moore's character *at the expense* of the *whole British army*."—Quarterly Review.

"—That this is the author's real feeling, we are warranted



in inferring, from the *numerous* specimens of *presumptuous* and *impotent pride* which occur in *almost every page* of his work. —The author may thank their forbearance if he escape with only suffering public contempt, for *wantonly calumniating* so many respectable characters. The *garbled* extracts of letters, which the author presents to the reader," &c. "We wish the author had made us better acquainted with the general's journal, instead of his own *ignorant* and *prejudiced* remarks. His *puerile petulance*, and *malign sarcasms*, on Mr. H. Frere's letters," &c. "Among all the instances of *pride*, *petulance*, *sneering contempt*, and *illiberality*, with which this volume *fourmille*\*, we have noticed none more *false* and *outrageously abusive* than this. *Had* the author *possessed* even *common respect* for truth," &c. "If Mr. Moore persists in republishing such *base* and *vile calumnies*," &c. "We have yet scarcely noticed the half of our author's extraordinary remarks and reflections, which *merit* the *most indignant reprehension*; and we confess ourselves tired and grieved at examining a work *calculated solely* to *gratify* the *worst passions* of the human mind, and to *calumniate* the Spanish people and all their English friends."—Antijacobin Review.

---

5. A Sermon preached in the Tron Church, Edinburgh, 30th April 1809, by Sir H. Moncreiff Wellwood, Bart. D.D.

\* The Antijacobin Review is continually crying out against writers who introduce French phrases or words into their compositions; and resolves that practice into nothing short of a wish or a tendency to encourage the establishment of jacobinical principles. Yet it is absolutely not less certain than curious, that no publication that issues from the press is so assailable in this very point, as the Antijacobin Review itself; and that too, in examples the most inexcusable and puerile. In the name of all that is ridiculous and affected, what (for instance) is the superior degree of elegance or expressiveness in the French word *fourmillé*, to recommend it in preference to our good old English "swarms?"—to say nothing of the grotesque manner of its introduction here, after an English nominative.—SATIRIST.

"This discourse is distinguished neither by depth of thought nor energy of style."—Eclectic Review.

"With that *powerful* yet unaffected eloquence which we have before noticed in the discourses of this author, he explains both parts of his subject. There is a *warmth* and *earnestness* in the exhortations, which *irresistibly convince*," &c.—British Critic.

#### 6. The Battles of Talavera, a Poem.

"This writer is entitled to the acknowledgments of all lovers of *genuine poetry* and of British courage. *Every page* would afford a satisfactory specimen of the *justice* of our commendation. We have not often had a greater *poetical feast* than this small poem has supplied.—Seldom in this day do we see such animated strains composed with so much *classical correctness*."—British Critic, and Preface.

"This author abounds with imagery, *not his own!* and we frequently meet two or three of Walter Scott's metaphors contending for a line, or jostling against each other at the fag-end of a stanza.—No man who pretends to *think*, could write in *this manner*; but there are writers who, having *no faculty* in their minds of *drilling* the *ideas* with which they are fain to recruit their own *vacant imaginations* from the works of other authors, suffer them to rush out of their *feeble* cantonnments *helter-skelter, higgledy-piggledy, one a-top of t'other,\** to the *perversion* of *meaning*, the *confusion* of *metaphor*, and the *destruction* of *common sense*. Were it not for this *crash* of *imagery*, which so *repeatedly* occurs," &c. "Even in these stanzas the author seems to delight in destroying the strength and beauty of *every figure* by some *wretched conceit* or *broken metaphor*.—In this passage, we must either consent to admire every thing that is

\* This extract is from the "Beau Monde;" a title, we apprehend, equivalent in English to the "Fashionable World:" we presume therefore that it was in the circles of the *fashionable world*, that the critic picked up these truly refined and elegant phrases.—SATIRIST.

*incomprehensible*, or else condemn with those who honestly condemn whatever is *ridiculously absurd*."—Beau Monde.

7. *Grieving's a Folly* ; a Comedy, by Richard Leigh, Esq.

"This comedy has at least the negative merit of *avoiding* the grossly improbable incidents, and disgusting flippancy of style, that *characterize* the *modern* farces miscalled comedies. The assumed grief of a husband for the loss of a wife whom he detested, gives the name to this play ; but there is another plot more *interesting*, and *not ill-conducted*. We know not what success this drama had on the stage, but we found it *by no means tedious* or *uninteresting* in the perusal."—British Critic.

"*Modern Comedies* are nothing more than modern novels in dialogue ; silly, sickly medleys of puns, extravagant buffoonery, and false sentiment. This which we have just read, is one of the *most vapid* of the *whole species*. The story is *unnatural*, and the characters *more absurd* than the *worst* of 'Nature's vilest journeymen' could ever have contrived."—Beau Monde.







